

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1871.

ART. I.—ERNEST NAVILLE: HIS WORKS AND OPINIONS.

A BERLIN book-seller, on being asked recently in what store of the city a good supply of French works on theology could be found, replied, "In none. The Pastors of our Huguenot Churches can all read German, and no one who reads German ever thinks of looking to French writers for theology or science." This blunt remark of the German book-merchant is but a fair expression of the average German estimate of the French literature of the day. And, unfortunately, this estimate is, on the whole, too nearly just. The Second Empire has not been favorable to a vigorous growth either of free thought or of moral life. Its literature has partaken of the general atrophy—has thrown itself largely into the channels of doubt, materialism, and impurity.

But the somber picture is not without its light points. In the midst of the corrupt mass there has continued to be a select few to whom all honor is due. We cannot afford to despise French literature, so long as it is represented by such names as Godet, D'Aubigné, Gratry, Bautain, De Félice, Rougemont, Bersier, Astié, Pressensé, Caro, Janet, Secrétan, Broglie, Rémusat, Laboulaye, Quatrefages, Rosseeuw Saint-Hilaire, Milne Edwards, Saint-René Taillandier, and a host of others equally deserving. By the efforts of these men the banner of French thought is kept safe from trailing in the dust;

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXIII.—23

if not in advance, it is at least abreast with the general thought of the age.

Few names deserve more honorable mention in this connection than the one at the head of this article. Nine years ago* a paper in this Review called attention to the labors of M. Naville in the more complete rehabilitation of the works and philosophy of Maine de Biran. The recent publication in English of three series of lectures on the philosophy of religion places him more fully before the public, giving us, in fact, the choice fruit of thirty years of healthful, earnest thinking.

The purpose of this article is to give a rapid survey of this author's life, and of its significance for evangelical Christianity.

M. Ernest Naville is yet in the vigor of manhood, and in the midst of widely planned intellectual labors. He is of an ancient refugee Huguenot family, and was born December 13, 1816, in a village of the Canton of Geneva, of which his father was long the revered Pastor. His first studies were prosecuted under the direction of his father, who had founded in the village a private seminary. Subsequently he took a thorough course of philosophy and theology at the National Academy (University) of Geneva. At the age of twenty-three he received the degree of licentiate in theology, and shortly thereafter made a tour of several months in Italy, sojourning longest at Florence, but visiting also Rome and Naples, and returning to Geneva in July, 1840. Here he was employed in the "religious instruction of the youth," and was charged by the government with the superintendence of primary education in the Canton. In 1844, having been called to the chair of History of Philosophy in the Faculty of Letters of Geneva, he entered more outwardly and actively upon that career of philosophical labor for which years of predilection and meditation had been ripening him. But the sunshine of academic life was not to be without clouds. The Liliputian republic felt two years beforehand the throes of that political revolution which so suddenly threw all Europe into convulsion. In 1846 the conservative gave place to a very radical *régime*, and in 1848 M. Naville was expelled from his chair in consequence. At this time he renounced his character as ordained clergyman in the State Church of the Canton, and ever since he has preferred to

* October, 1862.

main in the ranks of the laity. The radicals, however, did not succeed in silencing his eloquent and healthful utterances. He opened a course of *free* lectures on philosophy, at first in a private hall; but at a later period, when the popular passions had calmed down, he transferred them to the National Academy.

His expulsion from his public professorship was the occasion of giving his labors a more decided literary turn. His voice, though silenced in the State auditorium, was, in fact, given a much worthier auditory. He addressed himself to the great literary public.

His first publication was "Maine de Biran, his Life and Thoughts," one volume, 1857—an exposition of the personal character and leading thoughts of his favorite master in philosophy. His next work was a painstaking labor of love, the collecting and editing of the posthumous papers of the sage of Bergerac. It appeared in three volumes in 1859, under the title, "The Inedited Works of Maine de Biran."

The first of these works, and the elaborate introduction to the second, obtained at once for M. Naville an honorable place among the philosophers of the day.

These volumes were successively followed by three works which made their author's name familiar wherever there are wide-awake students of Christian apologetics. "Life Eternal" appeared in 1861, "The Heavenly Father" in 1865, "The Problem of Evil" in 1868. These volumes, though of a strictly philosophical character, are yet popular in style, and were severally delivered with great success to audiences of males, first at Geneva, and then at Lausanne, before being finally edited for the press. They constitute each an attempt at a theodicy in the special field suggested by its title, the whole being an elaborate effort to justify the central doctrines of evangelical religion as opposed to the various godless systems of the day.

The spirit that breathes in these volumes is admirable and winning; is generous, hopeful, enthusiastic; but what is their scientific and theological worth? Are they but the honest theorizings of a good man to serve a good cause, or are they in the main solid, irrefutable truth?

These questions can better be answered after a brief glance

at M. Naville's philosophical position, at his notion of the mission of philosophy, and of how far it may and should be put to the service of religion.

While yet on the threshold of a cultured manhood, M. Naville's mind received an impression which formed the key-note to all his subsequent thinking. A German writer had published some verses which began thus: "Our hearts are moved with a tender sadness at the thought of the ancient Jehovah, who is about to die." They were a farewell tribute of tears to the departing phantom of the God of Christianity, and they caused in M. Naville's heart a sinister thrill which has never been forgotten, and all the more so, as he recognized in them a correct reflection of the opinion of a large proportion of the *literati* of the day.

M. Naville set himself to the earnest work of solving the religious question for himself. Is theology only mythology? Is existence an absolute enigma? Is all knowledge only relative, or may we *know* the origin and purpose of things? In the settling of these questions he was greatly helped by the works of Maine de Biran. He here based himself upon the thoughts of God as moral, personal, creative, and man as personal, free, and immortal. He became in fact a leader in the right wing of the French spiritualistic school—a tendency which is now earnestly working for the establishment of what may be called the Philosophy of Liberty.

This new spiritualism is daily gaining ground. It vigorously maintains the rights of the conscience, and is seeking to found on the notion of moral liberty a new system of metaphysics which shall satisfy at once the dialectic laws of reason and the moral wants of the soul.¹ It is true, this school has not at its head any such name as Leibnitz or Kant. Even Royer-Collard and Victor Cousin did not serve it as much as were to be desired. It halted too long in the doubts of Eclecticism. It began with great enthusiasm and wise principles, but it failed to bear much fruit. Its most significant divergence from Leibnitz and Descartes was in its preponderatingly moral character, its more healthful and full appreciation of the notions of duty and moral liberty. This phase of the spiritual life held the first place in the thoughts of Maine de Biran, the ripe conclusion of whose life-time of meditation was that "religion alone

can solve the problems which philosophy proposes." And this same tendency has been fruitfully pursued by Jouffroy, Jules Simon, Saisset, Janet, and Caro. Others might be cited in France, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland, who are faithfully working in the same direction. The efforts of Vinet have been especially productive. None, however, has better expressed the new philosophy and developed its rich consequences than Charles Sécrétan.* What with others was too often only a vague, general tendency, has become with him an original positive philosophy, with a full consciousness of its principle, and of its mission in the world.

To this new philosophy of liberty M. Naville belongs heart and soul. He regards the notion of moral liberty as something more than an excellent argument against Pantheism. It is a truth of immeasurable significance, one which is destined to give the theological world at last a satisfactory theodicy, and, in fact, to revolutionize every branch of philosophy. It invests the whole sphere of life with brighter and richer colors; it raises human thought at once and definitively above the dangers of Pantheism; it furnishes the only solid basis for the personality as well of man as of God; it alone enables us to understand their true relation to each other; it alone, in fact, gives dignity to our life and sublimity to our destiny. There is a law higher than that of logic—the law of duty. There is a grander and more beautiful world than that of the infinite evolutions of eternal force—it is the world of free spirits freely seeking God, the plan of infinite love realized by the free love of his creatures.

Such is the inspiring thought of M. Naville's life. To its establishment and propagation he has devoted all his powers. It draws itself like a silver thread through every page of his works. It is the bright sun which gives warmth and fructification to all his intellectual efforts.

More abstractly and summarily stated, this philosophy embraces the following three points: 1. The mind contains elements which are inherent in itself, and are known as metaphysical or transcendental, among which are the ideas of cause and purpose, and the notions of the one, the infinite, the necessary, the absolute. This is the reason in its special, philosophical

* "La Philosophie de la Liberté," second edition, 1866.

sense. 2. These ideas and notions manifest themselves only on occasion of experience, but in their totality they cannot be applied to the objects of experience, whether internal or external. The phenomena of nature reveal to observation neither their first cause nor their end. The human soul is a cause, and the idea of purpose arises from the contingent and limited. 3. The mind is by its very constitution prompted to search for the cause and the purpose of nature and of humanity, and this search conducts us inevitably to the conception of a First Cause of the universe, of a being answering to our conceptions of the Eternal, the Infinite, the One. There are, therefore, within us, besides the faculties of intelligence which enable us to observe and classify facts and determine their laws, faculties of another order, which demand also to be employed—unless, indeed, we admit that reason is a source of inevitable error, which would be equivalent to admitting that our nature is in a state of irremediable disorder, and would plunge us into a skepticism which could neither be attacked nor defended, because the attack as well as the defense would have to be made by reason, which had already been declared unreliable.*

The intensity of M. Naville's belief in moral liberty is the key to the choice he has made of a field for his Christian activity. He believes that every phase of normal spiritual life has equal rights, that the reason, the will, and the conscience may and should be equally satisfied and in perfect accord, and that consequently to show men the facts, the reasonableness, and the purpose of the divine law, is as real a serving the cause of moral progress as the more technical expounding of the Gospel. His labor, though philosophical rather than dogmatic, is none the less a part of the great work of turning the world to God. Though not in person ministering at the altar, he yet lingers in the neighborhood of the temple, raising a sweet voice in the hearing of all passers by, explaining to them the beauties of the sanctuary, and then conducting them if possible into the fore-courts.

In this course he has no difficulty in justifying himself. He holds that every wide-awake human being is, by virtue of his spiritual nature, necessarily a philosopher. For what is philosophy? It is a search after an explanation of the universe.

* *Revue Chrétienne*, April, 1869.

God made man with reason, and the peculiarity of reason is to ask, Why? Christians have all asked this *why*, and have settled it by *believing* Christianity for preponderating *reasons*. Those who never ask this *why* (of the universe and of life) remain in a state of spiritual infancy. Those who ask it honestly, but make no final positive decision, remain throughout life in a state of inquiry and fluctuation. This class numbers many individuals in all civilized communities. It is to them that wise apologetics may render fruitful service; but the positive religionist has also need of all possible service of this kind. There is scarcely any Christian who has not somewhere in the sphere of his beliefs a place which needs strengthening, a place where he is in hesitation or doubt. On some point or other his view of revealed doctrine is in violent and painful conflict with his conviction of the teachings of philosophy, in which case there is always error somewhere, for true philosophy and correctly understood revelation are always and necessarily in perfect harmony. They are the truth, and no one truth conflicts with another, and all truths which are truths are equally sacred, be they revealed in the intuitions of the soul, in the phenomena of nature, or in the articulate word. All these separate truths are but parts of *the truth*—but different rays from the one central sun. They are collectively the soul's natural heritage; their united and harmonizing effect alone constitutes the true daylight of the soul, setting God, nature, and humanity in their true relations to each other. The shutting of our eyes to the light coming from either of these sources not only involves us so far in darkness, but pretty surely reacts disturbingly on the light which comes to us elsewhere. Revelation, intuitions, nature—these must mutually uphold and relieve each other. If we ignore the voice of conscience we may do revelation the insult of finding in it fatalism, unconditional election and reprobation, passive regeneration, the direct punishment of one moral agent for the particular acts of another, etc. If we disregard the help of science we run a risk of understanding the Word puerilely, taking popular or poetical allusions for intended physical truth. If we lightly esteem the Word we inevitably fall into error somewhere, ignoring the personality and the liberty of God or of man, or of both, merging humanity into deity or deity into humanity, denying moral

evil, or, which is the same thing, declaring it a necessary incident of finite being. It is only by having attentively heeded all three of these sources of truth that the body of Christian knowledge is to-day in so relatively advanced a state. Science, metaphysics, and revelation have lent each other a helping hand, and have in turn elucidated and transfigured each other. And it is only by their harmonious co-operation that any absolute progress in the knowledge of the truth can be expected in the future.

To make a free use of all attainable truth in the elucidation of farther truth, with a view to a progressively clearer solution of the problems of existence, is to philosophize. To philosophize is, therefore, simply to seek the truth—the whole truth. In this sense of the word every true man is, in so far, a philosopher. In this sense M. Naville willingly accepts the title. He is devoting his life to the cause of absolute truth. His chosen life-task is, to the extent of his powers, to bring the thinking of his age more nearly in harmony with absolute truth; in other words, to break up the gulf of prejudice and misunderstanding which intervenes between so-called science and the truths that are implied and contained in revelation.

The method he has adopted in this work is peculiarly happy. He places himself on a broad philosophical basis, leaving in abeyance, for the time being, all questions of dogmatics proper. He claims for philosophy simply its universally admitted task—that of seeking a solution of the collective *facts* of being. But what are facts? Facts are whatever *is*. Facts are whatever holds a place in history or experience. Conscience is a fact—as real a fact in human life as is hunger or thirst. The intuition of duty is a fact—no less a real fact than the sensation of heat. Liberty is a fact, an immense fact, the most real and essential of all the facts of human life.

Now it is the chronic misfortune of philosophy to have ignored some of these essential facts, while at the same time seeking to solve the *whole* enigma of being. As well attempt to solve an algebraic equation without taking into account all the factors. This has been especially the case with the fact of moral liberty. And this single oversight is sufficient to explain all the follies, absurdities, contradictions, and fruitlessness which have characterized so-called philosophy hitherto. Because men

could not comprehend how the will could be a cause unto itself—could put forth volitions without being itself acted upon—they have denied the fact. Because they see not how evil could *begin* to be, they have denied that it *is*—have ignored its presence in the equation they attempt to solve. Because they could not understand how a primitive sin could vitiate all the individuals of the race, they have denied the fact of the moral solidarity of humanity. But these facts are none the less facts for their mysteriousness; and true philosophy must frankly accept them as such, and attempt, as far as possible, to comprehend them. In this attempt the whole sphere of human history is at its command. Christ is as legitimate an object of philosophy as Plato. A philosopher may help himself from the teachings of Christ as properly as from those of Plato—may confess himself a Christian or a Platonist without impairing his character as philosopher in the one case more than in the other.

M. Naville has used this liberty. He finds in Christianity the germ of a philosophy purer than that of Plato, sounder than that of Kant—the only true philosophy, the philosophy toward which all other honest philosophies have ever been darkly groping, the Philosophy of Liberty, the philosophy of the future. In M. Naville's opinion the great dogmas of Christianity furnish the hypotheses which best solve the enigmas of existence. But this philosophy is given us only by implication, only in germ. It is the duty of Christian reason to develop and construct it. Toward this end M. Naville is employing all his powers. The three apologetic works above mentioned are parts of the result. The first sheds the combined light of science and the Gospel upon the great dogma of the immortality of the soul; the second, upon that of the creating and redeeming Divine Personality; the third, upon the origin, nature, history, and remedy of evil. These will be followed by a fourth, on the philosophical and world historical significance of Jesus. In addition to this M. Naville "is engaged in preparing a complete *Course of Philosophy*, which he has delivered orally at the Faculty of Letters, (at Geneva,) but which cannot be published before several years."

Thus much will give some notion of the *savant*-phase of M. Naville's life. It has, however, another and no less interesting phase. M. Naville is no recluse, no mere academician;

he is an active power in society. He does not lock up his best thoughts in abstract formulæ, designed solely for the scholar. They are enshrined in a happy literary form, and brought within the grasp of the great public. Before receiving their final form they were mostly delivered as lectures, with those winning graces of oratory of which French professors seem as yet to retain the secret. I yet distinctly remember with what enthusiasm the theological students of the seminary of Lausanne spoke of the delivery of the series on "Eternal Life" in that city some years ago. The literary polish which he has given his works has not been labor bestowed in vain. Though troubling himself little with modern languages, he has had the pleasure of seeing himself wholly or in part translated into German, Dutch, English, and Italian, and even Russian and modern Greek.

But we would do M. Naville great injustice were we to make the impression that his influence is mainly of a merely intellectual character. On the contrary, the peculiarity of his writings is that they speak, not to the intellect alone, not to the will alone, not to the conscience alone, but to all of them at once—to the whole spiritual nature of man. They abound in serious frankness. No unwarranted advantage is taken. In turning their pages you feel that you are brought face to face with a generous, earnest, cheerful friend. The heart is touched and the conscience quickened, at the same time that the judgment is informed. A charming feature of the three apologetical books is a semi-autobiographical thread that meanders through them. M. Naville gives us frequent glances into the secret history of his interior life. Every here and there we are told of the lasting impression made on his conscience by some seemingly insignificant incident—incident that set his own life in a new light, or revealed virtue in the midst of seeming utter depravity, or gave his conscience a sharp reproof. One example: He heard two grave divines, in the presence of a simple-hearted, aged woman, finding traces of heresy in a received translation of the Bible, and suggesting a new version. On referring to the woman for her opinion she said, "Would it not be enough if we were all as good as this translation requires?" It proved a seed-word that did not miss its fruit.

Though no longer technically a clergyman, M. Naville is yet an active worker for the Church. He is a constant con-

tributor to her periodicals—has furnished her with several popular biographies—among them of Madame Swetchine, Professor Diodati, Père Girard. He is liberal toward those from whom he profoundly differs, and is on terms of intimacy with some of the great theologians of liberal Catholicism. In ecclesiastical sympathies he is with the warmly evangelical tendency represented by Vinet and Pressensé, though he is scarcely so radical as the latter. In the Evangelical Alliance he takes a deep interest. He cannot attend its session in New York, but he has written and addressed to it a discourse on the relations of philosophy and the Gospel.

M. Naville's life has also a political phase. He is a Conservative Republican. This much might be inferred from his expulsion from his professorship by the ultra-radicals. For several years he has been laboring to effect a reform in the political representation of the people—such a one as shall admit a proportional representation of the minority, so that the collective legislature shall be of the same political complexion as the collective population: a reform that is evidently needed also in America. On this subject he has written some valuable pamphlets.

A closing word as to M. Naville's personal character would not be superfluous. His character stands forth in the matter and spirit of his writings as clearly as years of acquaintance could reveal it. He is a man in all senses of the word—clear-headed, upright, warm-hearted, hopeful—a noble representative of that aristocracy of head and heart of which Genevan history offers so many examples. His family circle is what might be inferred—what a truly Christian family ought to be; a little regained Eden. In his church-going habits M. Naville is, however, a little peculiar. Though usually joining with the worship in a plain chapel near his residence, he yet does not limit himself to that, but frequently visits the various other congregations of Geneva. One of his intimate friends, when asked as to his usual place of worship, remarked, smilingly: "Ah, sir, in this respect M. Naville is very peculiar. There is nothing which he finds so tedious as a sermon. He worships a little *every-where*." Evidently this statement must be understood as reflecting, not on our author's piety or good taste, but on the liveliness of the Genevese sermonizers.

ART. II.—SOUTH AMERICA AS A FIELD OF MISSIONARY LABOR.

OVER thirty years ago a Methodist Episcopal Church was formed in Buenos Ayres under the direction of the Missionary Society of our Church. Rev. Dr. Dempster was the first Pastor. This Church continues to exist and to prosper, and is now presided over by Rev. W. G. Jackson, who is also Superintendent of our South American Mission.

Over five years ago a second Methodist Episcopal Church was founded, likewise under the direction of our Missionary Society, in the city of Rosario, of which the writer was the first Pastor. Continuing five years in charge of this station, he was succeeded, a few months ago, by Rev. Thomas B. Wood. The city of Buenos Ayres contains a population of two hundred thousand people, and has four Protestant Churches, namely: one Methodist Episcopal, one Scotch Presbyterian, one Protestant Episcopal, and one German. The city of Rosario, which lies on the banks of the Parana river, about two hundred miles from Buenos Ayres, has a population of eighteen thousand, which, by the enlargement of its commerce and shipping, is rapidly increasing.

There are certain facts which render South America a promising field of labor :

1. The tolerance of all forms of religion by law, and generally the *absolute liberty* of worship in practice, have removed every legal barrier to the promulgation of the Gospel, either by preaching or by the distribution of the Bible.

2. The favor with which these descendants of Spain look upon Protestant ideas seems singularly and providentially to have prepared the way for the kingdom of God. One of the missionaries of our Church, the Rev. Mr. Thompson, has been engaged for some time preaching in Buenos Ayres and Monte Video in the Spanish language. Every one who has heard him knows that he does not spare the errors of the Roman Catholic Church—that he is most decided and outspoken in his attacks upon them. He has gathered around him a number of Spanish converts, among whom is a Roman Catholic priest. One evening in Buenos Ayres, when Mr. Thompson was presiding, and

this priest was lecturing in Spanish, a boisterous son of Erin, incensed at his statements in regard to the Church, interrupted him with the loud allegation that what he said was false. Instantly he was silenced and put out of the room, in which, although many native Spanish people, professedly Roman Catholics, were his auditors, there was not a single voice to support him. The subject was taken up, immediately after, by nearly every native paper in Buenos Ayres, and without an exception that we have heard of, every one of them spoke out strongly in favor of the American Church. An example in Rosario, in the interior of the Argentine Republic, shows the same spirit. A well-known Spanish gentleman there brought his four boys to the Rosario English school, and said he desired us not only to educate them, but to indoctrinate them with our ideas in every particular. We never lost more than a single scholar, to the best of our recollection, from religious prejudices during the five years that the school was under our direction, although the pupils were almost altogether composed of Roman Catholic children, many of them from the higher classes of the population, and although the New Testament was read by the pupils every day, accompanied by prayer, and three times a week a lecture was given by us in Spanish explanatory of evangelical religion, and detailing, according to the capacities of the children, as a basis of the discourse, the events of the Old Testament.

3. The docility of spirit shown by the educated classes on political subjects opens the door to the introduction of religious truth. The government of the Argentine Republic is a copy, as nearly as possible, of the government of the great Republic of the United States. Hence a veneration and respect for their northern and more powerful sister, with a desire to copy her social customs. It is a general sentiment that the people of the United States, and, indeed, all English-speaking people, are ahead of them in the various branches of the arts and sciences, and especially in their educational institutions. An intelligent gentleman said to us in substance one day, "We desire your people to come to our country that we may learn from those who are superior to us."

4. The comparative freedom from religious prejudice of the people, their rulers, and even their clergy. We do not recol-

lect a single instance in which a tract, book, Testament, or Bible has ever been refused when offered by us as a gift, except from inability to read. On the contrary, they are gladly and gratefully accepted by all classes, often with the question, "How much shall we pay?" During our five years' residence in Rosario, in the midst of Spanish Roman Catholics, we never received an insult from them, directed against us as a Protestant or a Protestant minister. If at any time we happened to be among persons to whom we were unknown, the fact that we were a Protestant minister, on becoming discovered, instantly commanded respect. Among the very first children sent to our day-school at its opening were three Spanish children. Long afterward, in conversation with their mother, she remarked to us, "I told the priest that we sent our children to your school, and he said it was well, that you were a good man." One day we offered Señor Piñero, who is the presiding officer and priest of the Spanish Roman Catholic Church in Rosario, a copy of the "South American Monthly," a magazine, hereinafter referred to, which we published in Rosario. He accepted it with thanks and evident pleasure. Not long after, on a visit to his house connected with some business, we saw it lying on his table, open to the inspection of every one. In the course of a long conversation with him at that time he remarked, "Whatever our differences may be on some points, we are all brethren in Christ." And such is the very declaration, we are told, he has made from his own pulpit.

In our visits to the interior of the country we have gone out where the native people were at work, and have given them religious books and tracts in Spanish, and, when our supply was exhausted, have been followed and importuned for more, and have left little knots of people listening to one who, better educated than the others, had gathered them around him that he might read the Gospel to them in their native tongue. Traveling one day in the cars of the Central Argentine Railway, we gave some Spanish tracts to the passengers. On such occasions they always gladly received them, but it was like seed cast upon the waters, which we never expected to hear from in this world. Some time afterward (it may have been months) we were making a visit at the house of a native family, the children of which attended our school. We were sitting at

their hospitable board, when an old gentleman, whom we learned afterward was a relative of the family, accosted us familiarly in Spanish, "Do you not know me?" "I do not recollect meeting you." "Do you not remember me in the train? Have you forgotten this?"

He took out his pocket-book, opened it carefully, and taking from it a paper, as if it had been a bank-bill, exhibited a four-page Spanish tract, which I then remembered to have distributed on the occasion to which I have alluded.

There was a gentleman in Rosario who, we were told shortly after our arrival in that city, was a strict Roman Catholic. He kept a book-store, and was the proprietor of the principal Spanish newspaper. We became acquainted with him by meeting him in his place of business, and during all the time of the publication of the magazine already referred to no brother could have given us more effective or more valuable assistance in every thing we needed than this estimable man. The name of Don Eodoro Carrasco will ever live pleasantly in our memory, associated with every literary effort there. We do not say that the Church of Rome has changed in her doctrines or her practices, but we say that the people who profess to belong to that Church whom we have met in South America have not the religious bigotry we have observed in other places.

Such are some of the facts which render South America a promising field of labor. They apply to the native or Spanish population. We are not now speaking of the English-speaking people who have settled among them. There are, as in every place, obstacles to be overcome, the chief of which is the utter indifference of the people to all spiritual religion. They are a gay, polite, pleasure-loving people. The few who think seriously reject too often every thing that is supernatural in the Bible, and base their religion on morality. The great question is, How shall we reach them, and how reach the English-speaking population dwelling among them? Five modes were in active operation during the whole or part of the time of our residence in Rosario :

1. The distribution and sale of the Bible. It is generally conceded that, except in rare cases, it is better to sell the Bible than to give it away. It is more certain to be valued. Thousands of copies of the word of God have been sold already, and

will no doubt produce fruit. Andrew M. Milne, Esq., Agent of the American Bible Society, residing formerly at Rosario, and now at Monte Video in Urugnay, is active in this good work. George Schmidt, formerly employed by him as colporteur, a man who never feared the face of man, with wonderful tact has explored many of the towns of South America, leaving the good seed wherever he went. This remarkable man is now engaged selling Bibles, school-books, and other useful works on his own account. The agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society are occupied in other quarters.

2. English Churches have been established by different denominations at various points on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as well as in the interior, to reach the English-speaking people who are drawn to this southern clime. These are doing a work which has two aspects: the direct benefit of the class to which it is addressed, and the indirect effect upon the native South American people. It must be confessed that this is a slow and gradual work, and yet it is an important and indispensable one. It is slow, because (though the number of persons who speak the English language is considerable) the Church-going people are comparatively few; it is slow because men who have become Gospel-hardened in their own land go there, not to remain, but to grow rich, and to be religious, if ever, after they return to the United States or England; it is slow because the influences of intemperance are more terribly effective, because the Sabbath is every-where a holiday, and because men of sterling, decided religious principles, capable of resisting the current around them, so rarely come, even as temporary residents, to the help of the missionary. It is at the same time important and indispensable because children are growing up who, if left without religious influences, will be drawn irrecoverably into the vortex of sin, but who may be early trained to become our supporters and Church-members; it is important and indispensable because, as far as our own people and our own language are concerned, we must not leave them to be a curse to these fair lands; it is important and indispensable because, if we cannot induce the people who speak our tongue to be godly men, it is hard to reach the native classes. They, like every one else in every place, will look at our works, will look at the kind of Christians we are ourselves,

and then judge of our religion and our preaching by the effects which they produce. Notwithstanding the difficulties in the way, English and American Churches have been established by different societies, and are in successful operation within the cities of Buenos Ayres, Valparaiso, Santiago, Rosario, and at various other points in South America.

3. A third mode is the preaching of the Gospel in the Spanish language. This has succeeded in Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres. But in both of these cities the Gospel has long been preached in English. Many years ago Dr. Kidder was missionary in Rio, not to mention others of different denominations who have labored there. Thirty years and more ago, as we have already stated, the American Church was formed in Buenos Ayres. There is no doubt that success in both cases among the natives largely proceeds from the seed cast upon the waters in those years when, toiling under discouragement, devoted men labored among the English-speaking classes. The American Church in Buenos Ayres is composed mainly of persons who speak both Spanish and English, many of them born in the country of English parents. Previously to any attempt at preaching in their own language to the natives in that city there were held in our church, morning and evening, two regular English services. These were both well attended. To facilitate the Spanish work the evening English service was changed to Spanish, so that the English congregation, speaking Spanish as they did, became the basis of the Spanish congregation. How far successful preaching to the natives, independently of all English influence, may become, is yet to be seen.

4. Without undervaluing the distribution of the Bible, or the preaching of the Gospel, either in Spanish or English, we proceed to notice another mode, already hinted at, wherein success is certain. It is a mode which may and ought to include within itself all the rest we have named—a mode for which the providence of God seems to have opened the way in South America: we mean the establishment of schools.

At the time we arrived in Buenos Ayres (February, 1864) we could count about seven or eight of the members of the American Church who were at the head of academies or schools. Some of them had for years been occupied in this profession on their own account solely, receiving no help

from the Missionary Society. They had educated many of the prominent native men who had already gone forth into public life. We call to mind at the present time the large academies of Messrs. Parody, Negroto, Junor, and Reynolds, each in separate sections of the city, and each educating great numbers of native boys. Even our young Church in Rosario has now a representative in this work, who has charge of a recently formed, and yet small school in Monte Video. Messrs. Parody, Negroto, Junor, and Reynolds have, at different times, been the superintendents of the Sunday-school (three of them, at least, if not all) connected with our church in Buenos Ayres. Let us imagine, then, what an influence on the native society such schools must have, conducted by such men, on the principles which they would adopt. They have been sowing widely the seed, and the harvest will yet come. For five years, with such assistants as we could secure in Rosario and Buenos Ayres, we kept the Church school going in the former city, depending, on account of the small number of English children in the place, for its support almost altogether on natives. At one time the number of our pupils went up as high as fifty-eight, and, if we could have secured proper help, or could have devoted ourselves exclusively to that work, it might have been further enlarged. During all this time we never failed to instruct the children carefully in religious truth, opening the school always with prayer, and, as we have already said, reading the New Testament and giving regular lectures in Spanish on the Old. This was never objected to but once, when we received a message from one of the parents requesting us not to require her son to read the New Testament. We replied it was the rule of the school and must be complied with. We heard no more objections, and the child continued in the school almost to the time of our leaving the country. Even the government has shown itself so favorable to our schools that on two occasions it made monthly subsidies of money to assist Church schools established in the region of Buenos Ayres. I have been told by a gentleman long a resident on the west coast, and formerly a director of a school there, that throughout all the countries of South America the people not only send their children to schools established by English-speaking persons, but that they prefer them to their own.

We have detailed these facts for the purpose of showing what a vast field there is in South America for those who desire to give themselves to the work of teaching. We do not advise young men to go there who have not fixed religious principles. They will find the current of irreligion too strong for them. But if a man of principle and industry will go to any town of South America with a desire to do good, and establish an English school, and as he becomes familiar with the language teach his pupils in Spanish, he will sow the Gospel seed in a soil where it is certain to take root. Before they are carried away by the flood of irreligion which surrounds them the children will learn to read and value the Bible, they will begin to apprehend the great purpose of life, and by line upon line, precept upon precept, they will become prepared, just as the twelve tribes were prepared during those forty years that God led them in the desert, to enter a higher life. We must remember that God does not always work in the same way, but according to the age in which we live, and according to the moral attainments of the people we aim to reach. If he has opened a way to preach to the children of South America, how earnestly we should endeavor to shape our plans according to his! It is this watching God's providential openings which makes effective our work for him as well as our zeal and industry. It was thus with the apostles. They went where the Spirit directed them. They passed over into Macedonia when God pointed out the way. They saw also the indications of the Spirit as to the mode. At one time it was standing on Mars Hill and preaching, at another instructing Lydia, at another teaching the jailer and his household.

We proceed to notice another mode adopted by us before we left the country. There is, as we have already hinted, a large English and American population in many of the cities of South America. We cannot state the number, but if we add together those residing in the cities of Rio Janeiro, Monte Video, Buenos Ayres, Rosario, Valparaiso, the total will be thousands. While the number of English people far exceeds that of the Americans, yet the latter are numerous. Among all these people throughout the whole of this vast territory, from the Isthmus of Darien to Terra del Fuego, three years ago there was not a single religious newspaper or periodical

published in the English language. Papers and magazines from England and the United States were in circulation, but extremely few of them were religious, because extremely few of the people care for any religious reading, and would rarely subscribe for it unless it were brought to their very doors. Besides this, the mail delivery of newspapers and periodicals from the United States is very uncertain. Of those subscribed for by ourselves we generally received not more than half, although the postage was paid in New York, and they were regularly forwarded. Still further, our Churches in Buenos Ayres and Rosario are American, while the congregation and supporters of each are principally English people or their descendants. Even, therefore, if we could have received the publications of our Church regularly it was difficult to interest the people, being English, in our Advocates, our Repository, our Missionary Advocate, our Quarterly Review. Added to all this was the fact that on the whole of the eastern coast throughout the cities of Rio Janeiro, Buenos Ayres, Rosario, and Monte Video there was but one English paper of any kind, and that was a secular one, conducted by gentlemen who were Roman Catholics, and whose voice on the great questions of evangelical religion, the observance of the Sabbath, the temperance reform, was adverse.

We, therefore, started an English magazine, devoted to education, literature, and religion, for the purpose of forming a public sentiment in favor of religion, in favor of the Sabbath, in favor of temperance, among those who attended no sanctuary, and for the purpose of giving power and unity to the opinions of those who still clung to the moral principles they had brought from their homes. Our magazine was entitled the "South American Monthly," and for a year and seven months before we left the country it was regularly published about the first of every month in Rosario. Always moral in its tone, though not exclusively religious, we aimed in every number to strike a blow for religion, for temperance, and for the Sabbath. It is not surprising that we received little countenance from the English newspaper we have named. It would have been strange if it had been otherwise; but through all difficulties we continued our way. Not stopping to notice any attacks upon us, our "monthly" increased in circulation, and paid its cur-

rent expenses from the first, so that it never drew a single dollar either in its commencement or continuance from the funds of the Missionary Society. It circulated in the cities of Monte Video, Buenos Ayres, Rosario, Cordova, Asuncion, in Paraguay, and almost at every station along the line of the Grand Central Argentine Railway. This circulation, according to the liberal postage law of these countries in regard to non-illustrated papers, was always free.*

Unassisted, as we have said we were, in this work by the English paper of Buenos Ayres, it was just the reverse with the Spanish newspapers. Almost without an exception, at every monthly appearance of our magazine it was greeted with a commendatory notice from the principal Spanish newspaper in Rosario, speaking in favor of our work, in favor of ourselves, and recommending the moral and religious character of our publication. Articles were frequently translated and published in Spanish, thus reaching in this indirect mode the native inhabitants of the country. If there ever was a providential call for an effort of this kind it seemed to be this; if there ever was a need of the religious use of Heaven's gift to man, the press, it is among the sister cities of our southern hemisphere.

Throughout these republics of South America the preaching of the printing press in English, multiplied like the leaves of the forest, should stand side by side with the preaching of the Gospel in the pulpit and in the school. Our literature should be scattered day after day from house to house, so pregnant with interesting facts that the native secular papers will translate them, and carry them to their thousands of readers.

There are three great points we must carry: the Bible, the Sabbath, and Temperance. The Bible, its truth against infidelity, its sufficiency against superstition, its atonement against Mariolatry, is the foundation stone; the Sabbath, its holiness as a day against the promenade, the race-course, and the dance, must be gained or there can be no living Christianity; temperance against the wide-spread use of ardent spirits must be patiently, urgently, perseveringly advocated, until the rock yields and we penetrate the consciences of the masses of the people:

And how shall we accomplish this if we neglect the great

agency of the printing press, which we confess has done so much among ourselves ?

We have thus enumerated these different modes of reaching the inhabitants of South America, and proceed to answer two questions which naturally are suggested to the reader, namely : 1. Is life safe in those distant regions ? 2. Is the climate healthy ?

1. Is life safe ? Much is said against the native people and the native character by foreigners in South America. We often hear such remarks as the following : "It is a fine country if it were not for the people." When we first went to South America we went there with the impression that our life was not safe in a native town. Going out shortly from Buenos Ayres a hundred miles to preach, and obliged to stop on the route in a native village until morning, we felt some little anxiety as to how we should pass the night alone in such a place. Proceeding to a hotel, we asked for a sleeping-room, a room in which we would have no fellow-lodger. The answer was that such we should have if possible. Being conducted to a large chamber, we observed that it contained six beds. Thinking that they might be intended for some special occasion, and that we were to have the six beds for that night to ourselves, we lay down to sleep. Soon a fellow-lodger came in, and rattled down his gaucho-belt, which sounded like a sword and chain. Then another and another, until the six beds were full. Thoughts of assassination and murder chased each other rapidly as we lay there in the dark, until finally we committed ourselves to our Father's care, and remembered that we could go to heaven if we should die from the blow of a gaucho-assassin in such a place as easily as from among Christian friends ; that every-where

"Jesus can make a dying bed
Feel soft as downy pillows are,
While on his breast I lean my head,
And breathe my life out sweetly there."

It seemed but a moment after that we heard the splashing of something like water. Looking up, we saw that daylight had appeared, and one of the dreaded gauchos had thrown the water in which he had washed his hands upon the brick floor,

according to their custom. We had sweetly and safely slept among them, and have learned since to have more confidence in the native people.

It would be more becoming the English and American character to make some effort to elevate the people of the country rather than to depreciate what there is good in them. They seem too often to aim at the reverse. Is there a low grog-shop in some native city? Not seldom you hear the English language behind the counter. Is there a drinking debauch among young men from the camp? You distinguish the English language in oaths and blasphemies high above all else. Is it strange, then, that many English-speaking people have been killed by the natives?

An assassination rarely happens where there has been no liquor. Conducting himself as a Christian and a gentleman, a man is almost as safe in a native town of South America as in any town of the United States. In one respect he is safer—house-breaking seldom occurs; the people have no talent for this accomplishment. During five years' residence in Rosario we recollect only one instance of burglary, and that was supposed to be the work of foreigners. The readiness of the lower classes to use the knife is proverbial, but a stranger need not descend to the moral level where the gaucho's knife will reach him. The children, even, are said to be so accustomed to the sight of flowing blood and the slaying of sheep and oxen from their childhood, that they have a certain pride in the dexterity with which they use the knife. And yet, with all the quarrels incident to children connected with our school experience in Rosario, we never knew more than a single case of the drawing of a knife upon another. There have, notwithstanding, been times in Rosario when every night some one was assassinated. As darkness settled down no one considered it safe—no one, especially in the outskirts of the town—to go outside of his house. At the time of the different revolutions in Rosario, and about the time of their elections, which are always held on Sunday, there are multitudes of gauchos from the country in the town. Sometimes hundreds of them are encamped in its vicinity, and murders are frequent; but they are murders of their own associates and their own people, and not, generally, of foreigners. A man has no need either to drink with them,

meddle with their politics, or wander about alone in the unlighted parts of the town.

He who goes among them to do them good at once acquires their confidence, and, if he do the work he proposes faithfully, he secures their respect and friendship.

2. Is the climate healthy? The prairies of our Western country are rich and broad, and bounteous in their reward of the laborer's toil, but too often the miasma of fever and ague for the whole lives of the first settlers renders existence a continual burden. The pampas of South America are equally rich in soil, and as broad and bounteous, but no fever is the result of breaking up their surface. Among all the new settlers for hundreds of miles around Rosario we never heard of a case of chills and fever as the result of opening new soil. Whenever such a case occurs it is brought down the river from the tropical regions nearer the equator. The cholera was twice a visitor of Rosario during our residence there, and with great malignity spread from town to town and from house to house in the rural districts. It was not the scourge of the city alone, as it usually is with us, but selected its victims every-where throughout the sheep districts. But it had never appeared in these regions before, and no one can make an argument from this against the salubrity of the climate. The utter contempt for all sanitary regulations had long been sufficient to provoke the breaking out of a pestilence.

The clear atmosphere, the almost constant sunshine, have their effect upon the modes of constructing the houses, so that certain things which are necessities to us are unknown in South America, or only regarded as luxuries peculiar to foreigners. The houses of the poor are built of mud, with grass roofs, within which no chimney is ever known, or stove ever seen. Winter and summer the cooking is done outside of the house on a little three-footed iron furnace called a *brazero*. If the weather be cold, they wrap their heads in a woollen shawl and sun themselves outside of the door. If it be warm they gather on the shady side of the house, or erect a temporary awning of leaves, in front of the door. The dwellings of the rich are constructed of large brick made every-where from the soil, and often put up with the mud dug from the land, which, in the absence of frost, is almost as durable as lime. Within, the rooms are

plastered on the wall and never lathed. Until recently fire-places and grates were almost unknown. To the natives they are not necessary. The winter months, which are June, July, and August, are sometimes cold enough for fire, but the natives prefer extra clothing and exercise. In Rosario the winters are usually long seasons of drought, with a clear sun, which renders exercise in the open air delightful and healthy. The better classes have a kitchen, which is never in the house, but some small building entirely separate, where, often without chimney, and in the midst of smoke, the cook performs his functions. Snow has been occasionally seen in the country around Buenos Ayres, but we never saw it in Rosario. Once or twice during the winter water is found frozen early in the morning, outside of the house, to a thickness of half an inch. During the night it is often extremely cold; the keen air penetrates to the very bones. In a wooden house a fabulous amount of blankets is used to keep warm, but the thick brick walls of the ordinary dwellings retain so long the heat of the day's sun that the cold air is tempered. Even in summer the nights are cool. At the close of a warm summer's day we were journeying on horseback several leagues in quest of an American family, when the sun went down. As the darkness gathered about us we became conscious of the painful fact that we were lost, and the cool air already blowing suggested an uncomfortable night, without overcoat, on the wide plains. The air became so piercing that we began to wish even for the hospitality of some native dwelling, when, happily, we reached a *pulperia*, where we hired a guide.

A person takes cold rarely from the changes of the seasons. Winter passes away, and there is no frost coming out of the ground to strike through the bones; you throw open your windows as in the midst of summer. The rain pours down in your *patio*, (paved yard,) and you sit by your open door without fear. The shower passes away, and the dampness occasions no alarm. The rain may beat in through your window or roof, and cover the brick floor of your bed-room, and you go to sleep without fear of danger. Consumption, so dreaded in northern climes, has lost its power here. We do not remember more than a single case which originated in the country. The fact that the climate permits every one to live out of doors is, per-

haps, one reason why consumption is so rare. Every respectable house has its *saguan*, or entry, which is open in the rear, and this in the daytime is one of the most pleasant places in the house—at one season for its shade, at another for the warmth which comes from the changed direction of the rays of the sun.

Having answered these two questions, look finally at the vastness of the field open to our missionary efforts.

An area equal to a great continent is before us. The empire of Brazil alone contains more territory than the United States did before the acquisition of Alaska. Watered by the Amazon and its immense tributaries, penetrating to the Andes, rich in every tropical production, the pioneers of commerce and agriculture are busy entering its most remote regions. The Argentine Republic, more to the south, on the Atlantic side; the republics of Peru and Chili, on the Pacific coast, more temperate in their climate than Brazil, are inviting foreigners to settle among them as a means of improving and enlarging their population; but more especially are asking educators for their children. By the side of and through the Argentine Republic runs one of the most noble rivers in the world. The "Rio de la Plata," so vast at its mouth that you are out of sight of land on both sides when you enter it, stretches inland until it changes its name to the "Parana," which, though more narrow, is so vast that the name given to it, "Parana," means "like the sea." We look with pride upon our noble Hudson, navigable for a hundred and fifty or two hundred miles; we boast of our great Ohio, through which a flat bottomed steamer can push its way for a thousand miles; we talk of our Mississippi, with its snags and shoals, as if it were unequaled by any river in the world; but you may leave the mouth of the grand "La Plata" in a steamer and pursue your way up the Parana or the Paraguay, unchecked by a single snag or a single cataract, for twenty-five hundred miles, into the very heart of South America. Far up on the banks of the Vermejo, one of the tributaries of this mighty stream, a party had gone up, headed by an American, shortly before we left, to cut the valuable cedar wood which abounds in that region. An American was occupied beyond Asuncion, the capital of Paraguay, where he had erected a saw-mill, in preparing the valuable woods of that

region for market. An American has lately constructed the grand Central Railroad from Rosario to Cordova, a distance of over two hundred miles, which was opened to the latter city three days before we embarked. Thus commerce is pushing its way to these remote and luxuriant regions. Gold, silver, and copper are already being disemboweled from beneath their surface. A late letter from South America informs us that there is great excitement in Rosario at the discovery of gold mines in the Sierras, and that a company was already at work, and had sent down the river specimens of the gold, so as to obtain the necessary legal permission to work the mines. Coal, it is well known, awaits the toil of the miner. Meanwhile the inhabitants are stretching out their hands to more favored lands, saying, "Come and teach us your manners, your customs, your language, and," though they do not express this in words, "your religion."

Señor Sarmiento, who is now President of the Argentine Republic, was elected to the distinguished office while he was in the United States as Minister for that country. He was elected partly because he was acquainted with our institutions, and had resided among us. We say partly, because Señor Sarmiento has one great hobby, which had its influence in his election, and that hobby is the education of the masses. Thirsting for knowledge, the people gave him their votes because they believed he would do his best to educate their children.

Prepossessed in favor of our great republic, imitating our form of government, admiring our school system, an American school-teacher or professor, an American mechanic or farmer, goes there already recommended because he is an American. How many families there are in the United States who would be glad to change their sterile soil and cold climate for the fertile plains and almost perpetual spring and summer of the Argentine Republic! Such persons, by going in colonies, will not be dependent upon the country for society. They will form a society of their own, and for social intercourse will depend upon each other. If they go in the name of God, and to promote his glory, as Abraham came to Judea from Chaldea, and as our pilgrim fathers came to New England, the Providence which notes the sparrow's fall will give them success; but if their object be a selfish, mercenary one--to increase in wealth

and lands—they must not be disappointed if they find themselves in a few years, as many have done, on a level with the native *gaucho* population in refinement, morality, and religion, and with but little prospect of ever gaining the very object for which they left their homes.

ART. III.—WESLEY AND METHODISM.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

IN 1743 the first Conference, or convocation of the leaders of Wesleyan Methodism, including six Pastors and four lay preachers, was held at the Foundry Chapel, London, and confirmed all the rules and proceedings of their chief in classing the whole membership in four divisions: the United Societies, Band Meetings, Class Meetings, and the penitents, or those who were still unconverted, but expressed a desire for salvation—the only condition requisite for admission to the fellowship of the Methodists. These classifications, since simplified, indicate the principles which have preserved Methodism, and constitute its force and permanence—that of a spiritual life in common, a seeking of souls for redemption, by the union and solidarity, so to speak, of the faithful, thereby forming what Spener had called *ecclesiæ in ecclesia*; for the Conference affirmed that they ought to continue to obey the Bishops in all indifferent things, and submit themselves to the canon law as much as conscience permitted. They remained, by right of pre-emption, in the Episcopal hierarchy, but stipulated for an actual independence. Neither the Episcopal nor the popular prejudice was satisfied with so little. The attacks of intolerance assumed more boldly the form of persecution: whole pages of the Journals and chronicles are filled with narrations of the disorderly and riotous demonstrations of which Wesley and his fellow-workers were the objects. In Staffordshire, in Cornwall, at London, he was insulted, maltreated, wounded. Wild bulls were driven into the gatherings of hearers in order to break up the meetings; petards and squibs were thrown among them; stones were hurled upon the roofs of houses for the purpose of injuring the preacher. The magistrates were not inclined to extend their protection to these peaceful assem-

blies; they naturally sided with the clergy, and were encouraged in their neglect and indifference by the declamatory opposition of these latter. To this day the register of the parish of Poole bears record of the expenses of certain church-wardens, payable to the inn-keeper of the place, said expenses being incurred for the purpose of chasing out the Methodists. In certain towns the people organized themselves for this commendable work, and the mob was master of the place for several days. At Walsal a placard was posted, announcing a certain day "for the destruction of the Methodists." Another placard at Wednesbury offered a reward of five hundred pounds sterling for their expulsion. Later the Edinburgh Theater announced the play of "Trick upon Trick, or Methodism Unveiled;" and the *Evening Post* of London contained news from Staffordshire of the insurrection of a people called Methodists, who, it was said, fired houses; for calumny was added to violence. Charles Wesley having prayed in public that God would lead back his captives, was accused of desiring the return of the Stuarts, which, in truth, was much debated at the time. His brother was also obliged to defend himself against the charge of holding secret communication with the Romish partisans of the Pretender, and was required by a magistrate to renew the oath of allegiance and the declaration against Papacy. It was reported that through the influence of his mother he had been something of a Jacobite in his youth, but he was so free from any such tendency in his maturer years that in 1745 he asked permission to exhort the royal army and urge upon it the necessity of eternal salvation, by the consideration of the public dangers. His disciples bore on the battle-field good testimony to his loyalty. It is asserted that at Fontenoy four preachers and a great number of Methodist soldiers fell in the conflict. Wesley was not only faithful to Protestant royalty, but he adhered to the political opinions of the Anglican Church. His preoccupation with spiritual concerns was incompatible with that direct and deep interest in the affairs of the world which begets and justifies opposition. His Tory critics accord him full justice in this respect; they remark with satisfaction that at the outbreak of the American War for Independence he declared himself on the side of the mother country, and when he saw the first kindlings of the

French Revolution he feared and denounced it as an incendiaryism. Unlike the other sects born or emancipated by the Revolution of 1640, his Church received little or no impulse from it in the molding of political opinions, and to-day, of all Dissenters, the Methodists furnish the fewest recruits to the party of the opposition. They are conservative by principle and by indifference; and it is observable that piety often invests indifference with respectability and good repute, and often confirms it as well.

Toward the middle of the century it was evident that the cause of Methodism had planted itself firmly and was gaining ground. Wesley was allowed to preach at Oxford, and the University of which he was Fellow permitted him to explain himself peaceably before its assembled functionaries. The period of conflicts had not entirely passed, indeed. The Wesleyan missionaries were often severely tested by the rigor of the seasons, by poverty and hostility. Nevertheless Wesley was one of the foremost men in England, and found himself the leader of a vast association which extended over all his country. He had also pushed his conquests into Ireland. He was astonished at the cordiality and eagerness with which its impulsive people received him; but in a country where passion and imagination are stronger than the development of reason, the effect was demonstrative rather than profound—rapid rather than durable. However, Methodism was established in Ireland, and notably in the city of Cork, where a remarkable man, Thomas Walsh, carried on the work with much ardor; and when Wesley made a second journey to the island he had the satisfaction of seeing the seed that he had planted germinating and growing abundantly. In Scotland he had received a respectful but hardly a cordial welcome. The Presbyterianism of the North was not so overcome with lethargy as that of the South, and it suited the simplicity of the Scotch character better than Anglicanism. Moreover, the steadfast, austere convictions of the people were hostile to innovations, and suspicious of Arminian tendencies; for the antagonism of the two doctrines (Calvinism and Arminianism) was steadily maintained, and the religious revival continued to follow two distinct courses. Schisms broke out even among the Wesleyan societies. “What a work might have been wrought in all this region,” wrote

Wesley, concerning Staffordshire, "if it had not been for the miserable contentions stirred up by the partisans of predestination, who have succeeded in turning from the good way so many souls that walked well! In the days of persecution, when we carried our lives in our hands, not one of them approached us; the waves were too high for them; but now that calmness is vouchsafed, they dare come upon us from every direction, and have robbed us of our children."

Yet a reconciliation had been effected between himself and Whitefield. They were not associated, as at first, in their labors, but they pursued simultaneously the same work, and, though differing on a question of theology, each had the same ideal of piety, and accorded with the other in efforts for the public good. A new phase of religious belief must have gained no small advantage of permanence and acceptance ere it attracts the consideration of the higher classes, and Methodism had at last won a hearing even from them. The extraordinary eloquence of Whitefield attracted their curiosity. He had made an energetic adherent of his doctrines, and patroness for himself, in Selina Shirley, widow of the ninth Count of Huntingdon. She was styled the Countess Matilda of Calvinism. She gave herself and her fortune to Christian works, endowed colleges, built chapels, gathered audiences in her saloon to hear her favorite preachers. It was there that Whitefield spoke before Bolingbroke and Chesterfield, both of whom appreciated his oratorical power. Pitt, also, one of the fittest judges of true eloquence, Lord Aberdeen, and the Duke of Argyle were members of these select audiences. The *salon* of Lady Huntingdon was one of much influence. Possibly it had some share in forming the present evangelical party of England.

Wesley having fallen gravely ill, Whitefield wrote to him from Bristol (December, 1753) a touching letter, wherein are these words:

The news I have received, causing me, as it does, to apprehend a fatal termination of your illness, fills me with apprehension. I pity myself, I pity the Church; but I cannot mourn for you who will ascend to a glorious throne and be received into the joy of your Master. He holds your crown; he will receive you amid the hosannas of saints and angels. I, a poor worm, who have awaited my dissolution these nineteen years, must remain below to toil and suffer yet a few more years. Ah! well, the chariots

of the Most High cannot long delay their coming, all unworthy though I am ! But if prayers could detain them you would not leave us yet. If, indeed, the sentence is already pronounced, and you are now to fall asleep in Jesus, may he sustain your soul and give you to die in the arms of Divine love ! Next week I hope to bid you my last farewell, should you still be on this sphere of sorrow and death. If not, reverend and very dear sir, good-bye, *ego sequor etsi non passibus aequis.* My heart is full, my tears overflow ; I fear that you yourself are too infirm for me to say more. May the everlasting arms of the Lord be around you !

Thus, despite the persistence of dogmatic differences, the friendship and Christian fraternity of their youth were restored. They sometimes spoke in the same assemblies ; their hearts were no longer estranged ; and when, sixteen years later, Whitefield died, while ministering to the Independent Churches of America, Wesley learned with emotion that the last wish of his friend was that he should preach his funeral sermon. This request he fulfilled in a chapel which Whitefield had built, and which seemed as a monument raised to his memory.

Up to the age of forty-nine Wesley had lived in celibacy. He believed that the freedom of a single state was desirable, if not essential, for his laborious life, especially for his habitual and prolonged journeys, which forbade his permanent settlement in any locality. Moreover, like Saint Paul, he seemed not to regard marriage as the most desirable state, though his heart had not remained intact from tender influences through all these years. During his early life in Georgia he had become attached to a niece of the chief magistrate of the colony, and had asked her hand in marriage. The proposal was declined ; and when, soon afterward, the young lady formed an alliance with another aspirant to her fayor, Wesley could not refrain from a feeling of resentment toward her. He followed her with an unquiet and jealous eye, and, believing that by virtue of his office he had the right to address her certain warnings, which she repelled with indifference, he went so far as to forbid her the communion. He thus drew upon himself the hostility of an influential family ; the latter instituted proceedings against him for his conduct toward the young lady, and the trouble he experienced thereby was one reason of his return to Europe. It is difficult at this remote date to judge of the motives which actuated him in the matter ; but it must be remembered that

he had not yet "come to himself," to find within, as he said, "the effectual working of the Spirit of God."

It is no less difficult to explain the motives which led him to marry in 1752, nor yet to comprehend how this skillful discerner of spirits, trained by long experience to penetrate at a glance, so to speak, into the secret heart of his adherents and auditors, should have been so egregiously deceived in the choice of a wife for his riper years. He addressed himself to a widow, the mother of four children, a woman of middle life, and of defined character, as one would naturally suppose. He stipulated beforehand that marriage should impose no restraint on the free activity of his life; that he should still have the care of all his societies, and should continue his yearly journeys, each of which averaged about five thousand miles. "Were I to travel a thousand less," he said to his betrothed, "as truly as I love you, I would never see your face again." The lady acquiesced in these conditions, but she had not considered in the account the effect of them upon her unquiet and jealous spirit; and scarcely was the union effected when she began to torment her husband with the most irrational suspicions. She respected neither his liberty nor his repose; jealously pursued him on his journeys, opened his letters, and kept watch over all his public and individual life. She was wretched herself, and made existence almost insupportable to him; she tried several times to effect a separation between them, and when at last, after twenty years of wearisome trouble, she left him never to see his face again, Wesley wrote in his Journal, (February, 1771:) "She has gone to Newcastle, I know not for what reason, saying that she should never see me again. *Non eam reliqui, non dimisi, non revocabo.*"

The life of a missionary is made up of a succession of labors and journeys, interesting indeed, yet of too uniform a character to admit of detailed recital. When the existence of Methodism was fully assured, and Wesley was at the head of an organization distinguished for zeal and talent, he became simply the administrator of government to the kingdom which he had formed and given to Christ, and his life was passed in abundant and monotonous cares. The violent hostility which had more than once caused bloodshed in peaceful assemblies had entirely subsided; his recognition by the higher ranks of

society caused him to receive all needed countenance and support from the magistrates. Yet he did not govern his people without opposition; aberrations of a fanatical character were manifest from time to time among them, and compelled ruptures and painful exclusions. The Anglican clergy continued to attack him. Two Bishops, one of them the noted Warburton, wrote against him with bitterness. He was compelled to answer accusations whose absurdity proves how readily and easily all constituted authority despises its opponents, and how rashly and ignorantly it speaks when it attempts to judge them. "He is a man," said Warburton, "who takes fools and renders them madmen."

This controversy convinced Wesley that, despite his sincere wish not to sever his last ties with the Establishment, he was in duty bound to institute an independent clergy. From his university education he had retained the belief in a transmission of authority from the Apostles to the Bishops. He had not contested the titles of the latter, when he was compelled to withdraw himself from their jurisdiction; but, at this time, reading in the New Testament that bishops and elders were in the same rank, he recognized the fact that a national Church is a political institution, and that the divine right of Bishops was an invention of the reign of Elizabeth; yet, in changing his opinion of the episcopacy, he was still unwilling to attack it. "This Established Church is truly a Babel," he was wont to say. "Let it exist as it may; I will do nothing to destroy it, but I will do nothing to hinder it from falling. Let us the rather busy ourselves with building the city of God."

The Methodists were not always freely allowed to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the Anglican Churches, and many of Wesley's followers were reluctant to ask permission to receive it of that clergy. The Dissenting ministers had voluntarily undertaken to administer it to their Methodist brethren, yet Wesley hesitated to approve their action, and the Conference of 1755 declared that it was not expedient to effect an absolute, entire separation from the Establishment. It desired, like Wesley, to leave a door open for reconciliation; but the organization of Methodism, the personal work of the genius of its founder, was confirmed and further developed by the Conferences of 1776 and 1770. The societies that it then

numbered, and the classes—germs of societies—included twenty-nine thousand four hundred and sixty-six members; and Wesley, when sixty-three years old, wrote as follows:

The power that I exercise I have not sought; it has been laid upon me, and I have had to use it as well as I could, and according to the best of my judgment. I have not coveted it; I have always borne it, and still bear it, as a burden that God has put on my shoulders, and that I have no right to reject; but find me any man who can and will charge himself with it, and I will be grateful to him and to you. To preach twice or thrice a day is no burden at all; but what is heavy indeed is the care that I have of the preachers and societies.

The last twenty years of his life furnishes us with a picture of happiness and peace, animated by an activity equal to that of his days of combat. His journeys as an itinerant, his visits as pastor, his studies and publications as an author, are all sustained with the same zeal, as if the cause had not been gained; as if he was not one of those who had overcome the world. He traverses several times the area of the United Kingdom, and every-where he witnesses the fruits of his labors. Insensible to the weight of years, his robust body and serene spirit are adequate to all the exertions and cares which devolve upon him by a vocation whose parallel it would be difficult to find. He is still able to address thirty thousand auditors in the open plain, and publishes his works in thirty-three volumes. Fervor and zeal herald his approach, good-will and reverence give him welcome. All the former clamor of opposition is stilled: he has become popular, and the favor of the people imposes the restraint of silence upon his enemies. During the ten years subsequent to 1770 the classes are increased to about fifteen thousand members; fifty-two itinerants are added to the hundred and sixty which the sect previously counted. Wesley writes to a friend:

Luther said that a revival could hardly last thirty years. The assertion is not always true. The present revival has already lasted fifty years, and, God be praised! it is as effectual to-day as it was twenty or thirty years ago; or, rather, it is more so. It has more extent and depth than ever. A greater number can bear witness that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. Let us hope that this revival will go on until the day when all shall be saved.

The progress of Methodism in both hemispheres compelled

Wesley to take action on a matter which he had long held in consideration. The organization of the Societies in the unity of a Church structure was incomplete, particularly in America. Dr. Coke, who had been chosen to supervise these latter, and whose memory is still cherished in the United States, was desirous to replace in some way the episcopacy which had been impaired and rendered ineffectual by the War for Independence. "I am convinced," said Wesley, "that I am an *Episcopus* in the scriptural sense as much as any person in England, for I do not consider that the succession is interrupted by a fable." He did not perceive that neither Christ nor his apostles had prescribed a particular form of Church government, but he was of the opinion that the episcopal form was the best suited for the American Churches. His colleagues were of one accord on the subject, and at Bristol, in September, 1784, by solemn imposition of hands he conferred upon Coke the charge of Superintendent, thereby investing him with the episcopal authority. The title of Bishop was revived somewhat later by the American Methodists. By this act Wesley placed himself and his Church on an equality with the Establishment. The Annual Conference, composed at first of a hundred preachers, was instituted as an ecclesiastical body, and was also empowered to perform most of the functions of a civil corporation. Thus it was made lawful owner of all the houses of worship, of which the principal, City Road Chapel, London, was built in 1778, and is to-day the mother Church of Methodism.

As for Wesley, his old age had scarcely begun when he was an octogenarian, for the infallible testimony of his Journal shows him to have borne the burden of years without abatement of his natural force. He was eighty years of age when he first visited the Channel Islands, whither his doctrines had already penetrated. In sight of the shores of France he pondered the project of extending his conquests to that country, and soon afterward Jersey and Guernsey sent missionaries to Normandy. Not until 1790, when he had reached the age of eighty-seven years, does he admit in his Journal that he begins to feel the feebleness of an old man. Yet he still preached thrice on Sundays; he visited all the chapels of London and its suburbs, and he set forth on a last tour through the North,

visiting anew the cities of the West and of Yorkshire, stopping at Newcastle, and penetrating into Scotland. Every-where, with the single exception of Glasgow, he noted the success and progress of his work. At Bristol he presided over the forty-seventh Conference that had been held since the opening of his mission. At Winchelsea he preached under a tree from the text, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." This was the last time that he spoke in the open air, and his Journal closes in October, 1790, with a simple note. He had preached, he says, in the morning at the Anglican Church in Spital-fields, in the afternoon at St. Paul's, Shadwell, "which was more crowded than ever," he adds, "while I expounded this important truth, 'But one thing is needful ;' and I hope that several determined to choose the good part." But he still continued to preach. His voice, though feeble, was heard during the following year, and not till the February of 1791 did he leave the pulpit never to ascend it again. It is stated that he preached not less than fifty-two thousand four hundred times from the date of his return from America. His friends have preserved the record of the slightest incidents, the least words of his latter days. All these touching details reveal the calmness of the good workman, satisfied with his work ; the pious security of the Christian resting on the promises of Jesus Christ. The sunset is all golden : not a cloud of regret, remorse, or fear is apparent to dim its mellow glow. The tenor of all his words is indicated by a remark made to some friends who came to solace him with their prayers and attentions : "I can only say to you to-day what I said at Bristol ; I am the chief of sinners, but Jesus died for me." He often repeated, in a low voice, "God is with us." Once he began this sentence : "Nature is—" "Soon exhausted," added a person present, finishing his thought ; "but you are about to be clothed with a new nature, and will enter the company of glorified spirits." "Yes, most truly !" he exclaimed.

He listened to the prayers and hymns offered by his friends. From time to time he uttered words of confidence and cheer—these among others : "The best of all is, God is with us ;" words which now form the motto of the Wesleyan Missionary Society. He expired on the morning of March 2, 1791, surrounded by his friends, uttering as he left them the single

word, "Farewell." "All fell on their knees," said one who was present, "and the chamber seemed filled with the Divine Presence."

We may differ in opinion as to the form wherein the mysteries of the Invisible should be clothed ; but assuredly there is nothing better for the soul to observe than to what extent human nature may be transformed by a pure purpose, a strong will, and a healthful conscience. John Wesley is assuredly one of the noblest examples of holiness in practical life, that is, of the true religious ideal of humanity ; but if we consider in him the man of nature, rather than the man of grace, we discover a greatness of character of which it would be hard to find a parallel except in the apostolic age. Luther, with more hardihood, more imagination, more genius, more of the gifts which have power with men, is less simple, less pure, less devoted—in a word, less irreproachable. The exalted model of both Luther and Wesley, Saul of Tarsus, superior to all, rises alone above the religious great men of the Christian era ; but who can say whether his mighty energy and vehemence could not well have been tempered with something of the patience and gentleness of his humble imitators ?

Wesley's life is one of the marvels of the last century. It was composed of itinerant, pastoral, and literary labors. He was called upon to proclaim the Gospel in the open air, to visit and rescue souls in peril or anguish—the sick, the dying, the condemned. The founding and government of the Churches, onerous theological studies, an examination of all the controversies of the time, and the composition of the essays and other works which they required, were some of the cares which filled up the measure of his activities. He fell short in no single condition of success for his heroic undertaking. Whitefield, it was commonly said, was the more eloquent speaker ; his sermons were more impassioned and striking. But Wesley was more nervous, more solid—less brilliant, doubtless, yet more winning. His reasoning was more forcible ; it reached the souls of his hearers directly, and asserted its power over them unquestionably. His literary productions are not of the highest order. They make slight pretensions to profound thought, or elegance of style ; but in a forcible, simple way he says touching and convincing things ; he expresses his thoughts

neatly, clearly, not seldom felicitously, with a rare combination of reason and sentiment. He is calm, yet the love of God and of men animates every page of his works. Philosophically considered, his mind was adapted to moderate rather than aggressive principles and parties ; to the good sense of practical life, rather than to the unattainable ideal ; at the same time he is impressed to the depths of his soul with the divine purpose in all things ; he is devoted to it, thinks of naught else, and consecrates to it with passion all the power of his wisdom and virtue. He has been accused, with some justice, of credulity, a love for the marvelous, a certain inclination for alarming the imagination of his followers, of producing violent emotions, and thereby causing doubtful if not dangerous physical disturbances. Assuredly he was no adherent of Locke or Shaftesbury ; but this tendency of his mind may have contributed to the extraordinary, if not altogether legitimate, power which he exercised over the world of his day. Possibly a less credulous man would have been less persuasive. It was apparently a new and bold idea to initiate a religious movement in the eighteenth century ; by the popular voice, to undertake the conversion and sanctification of the contemporaries of Chesterfield and Bolingbroke. Wesley succeeded therein, and justly merited the praise since accorded him as the first of theologian-statesmen. Macaulay also spoke truly when he said of him, "With his penetrating logic and eloquence he might have been eminent in literature ; but his genius for government was equal to that of Richelieu." His excellent biographer attempts with much warmth to defend him from the charge of ambition—a defense which seems both needless and impossible ; for who has ever risen to the exercise of extraordinary power without being more or less urged thereto by the passion for power, which is simply ambition ? How can a disinclination to dominion be characteristic of a great ruler ? And who have most loved power ? Were they not Alexander, Saint Paul, Luther, Cromwell, Charles V., Loyola, and other mighty men who, being born to command, have desired and striven for the sway that was theirs by the prerogative of nature ?

The result has exalted the workman and justified the work. Wesley at his death left to Methodism five hundred and forty preachers, and nearly a hundred and thirty-five thousand

members. Of these about two hundred and thirty preachers and fifty-eight thousand members were in America.

According to late statistics, England and Wales contain about thirty-four thousand five hundred places of worship. Of these upward of eighteen thousand are free churches; nine tenths of them are closed to the Anglican Liturgy. And as regards the whole population, only fifty-two in a hundred belong to the Establishment. The Wesleyan Societies occupy three thousand two hundred and forty-four chapels; the other Methodists five thousand three hundred and sixty-five. The latter include eight divisions: the Connection of Lady Huntingdon, Methodists of the New Connection, Primitive Methodists, Methodist Protestants, Bible Christians, Associated Methodists, Inghamites, and Welsh Calvinist Methodists. According to M. Lelièvre, Methodism throughout the world to-day numbers eighteen thousand itinerant preachers, nearly three million communicants, and probably ten million hearers.

These are significant figures. Yet if the work of Whitefield and Wesley had resulted simply in these statistical details, if it had not been an important movement in the national history, the moral phenomena would still afford us a subject of interest and study. The rise and progress of Methodism compels our attention as the manifestation of a spiritual need in an entire people—a trait of the national character which had lain well-nigh dormant for more than a century in the heart of the Anglo-Saxon race, and which perhaps would never have been aroused nor satisfied had not this renaissance of the Reformation found champions so signally gifted, and empowered to awaken faith in slumbering souls. The immediate results of their ministry were great, indeed; but the student of history discerns in their example and work an indirect force whose power cannot well be expressed by a merely mathematical estimate. Throughout all English-speaking countries they have originated a religious movement that has been in progress for a whole century, and has utterly refuted the predictions of all such prophets as Voltaire and Montesquieu. Not that they were prejudiced or incompetent observers. On the contrary, they convey to us a just and fair indication of the condition of the times. Judge Blackstone said, twenty years after Voltaire's visit, that though he had frequently and attentively listened to the most distin-

guished preachers of London, he had yet to hear a sermon wherein could be detected more Christianity than might easily be eliminated from a discourse of Cicero's, and that it would have been impossible to determine from the utterances of any of these speakers whether he was a Mohammedan or a Christian. Especially was this criticism applicable to the pulpits of the Establishment. The Dissenting communions still adhered to their dogmatic creeds, and retained in some measure their primitive zeal; but they were affected and somewhat incapacitated by the universal torpor, and lacked men capable of authority or of inciting them to a new life. Moreover, a rationalism pervaded their ranks; a rationalism not Antichristian, but yet ill adapted to engender and nourish the ardor which is essential to an efficient and communicative piety. Its effect was to put at rest all opinions or questions that agitated the heart. A nation finds relief in the cessation of controversy, and the fanaticism and persecution engendered by it; but such discussions as were rife at this period on differences in the phraseology and style of creeds, though they were in a certain sense an evidence of religious growth, do not give proof of that vigilance which we commonly associate with the Christian life.

An effort was made in Parliament to free the Dissenters from the legal restrictions imposed upon them; and the motion made by Sir William Meredith called forth some noble utterances from Chatham that deserve to rank with his famous reply to Walpole's sneer, or his last speech in the House of Lords. The motion was foiled by certain growing societies that had undertaken to lead the Church back to its first faith. It is well known that Lady Huntingdon took pains to awaken Lord North's resistance, and that she even succeeded in exciting the generous mind of Burke to that conservative prejudice which was later to render him deaf to every demand for emancipation and liberty. She had zealously continued her religious work in high circles, and had doubtless by her example incited men devoted to the Establishment to adopt with certain revisions Wesley's project of restoring life to the Church. As it always happens, Methodism was attacked by those who borrowed from it; its enemies were among its imitators. The founders of what is now called the Evangelical party, among whom was

Venn, men who had accepted the truth as delivered by Whitefield, began to seek a quarrel with Wesley, who thereupon instituted the *Arminian Magazine*; but these hostilities lasted not long, for Venn, Thornton, Miss Hannah More, and soon afterward, Wilberforce, had the good sense to abandon subtle questions of dogma for works of Christian charity; and for these latter Dissent offered them opportunities which they could not ignore, for the Dissenters had been aroused and stimulated by the example of the Methodists. Howard, Wilberforce, Thomas Clarkson, and William Allen arose and girded themselves for the reform of gigantic corruptions, the relief of multitudes of bondsmen. Organizations of men founded the Bible Society, Sunday-schools, and a score of other philanthropic institutions, while each sect had its missionary society; and to-day that of the Wesleyans is one of the foremost. All these undertakings had the sympathy and protection of the Evangelical party, called in the political world the Saints' party; for they were distinguished by a genuine piety, and had won their way to power in Parliament.

The same title had been given originally to the Methodists, and between them and the "Evangelicals" discord could not long continue. Wesley showed to the end of his life an earnest interest in all the undertakings acknowledged by a Christian civilization. There exists a letter of his bearing date of February 26, 1791, perhaps the last that he ever wrote, which is addressed to Wilberforce, and bids him Godspeed in the war he maintained against slavery, "that execrable infamy which is a scandal to religion, to England, and to human nature."

We have seen that the awakening of England by Wesley and his disciples has attested its genuineness by numberless organizations for the public good, and by a practical though not nominal union of the sects in these common efforts for the elevation and consecration of social progress. The hostility inspired by the French Revolution produced a more clamorous effect, particularly in the higher classes and within the limits of the Establishment; but it was lacking in purity, for its piety was not disinterested. It was Toryism that became devoted, and religion inevitably compromises itself when it incorporates itself with diplomacy, for the saving of souls and the regulating of a State are functions that have nothing in common. The

religious condition of England to-day is by no means that of ideal perfection ; yet the effects we have mentioned above are so wide-spread, so gracious, that all friends of religion must heartily pray for some analogous awakening in the countries of the Continent, and must hope that the day will dawn wherein the ardor of faith will be manifested as it is not now in their civil and social progress.

ART. IV.—GROWTH OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL IDEA IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By NATHAN BANGS, D.D.

History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D.

Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1796 to 1868.

History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By ROBERT EMORY, D.D., (1773 to 1844 inclusive.)

Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848 to 1868.

Annual Reports of the Sunday-School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1845 to 1871.

FROM the beginning of the Sunday-school movement Methodism has been intimately associated with its history and progress. While we would not take the well-deserved laurel from the brow of Robert Raikes, it must not be forgotten that when, in 1781, he pointed to groups of neglected children in the streets of Gloucester and asked, "What can we do for them?" it was a Methodist young woman who answered, "Let us teach them to read, and take them to church;" and the two together attended the first company of Sunday-scholars to the house of God amid the ridicule of the spectators. It must also be borne in mind that while the original design of Mr. Raikes contemplated the employment of salaried teachers, Mr. Wesley improved the plan by soliciting and obtaining volunteers from the members of his society, who labored in the Sunday-school gratuitously.

The same interest in the good work has ever been manifested by the Methodism of America. The spiritual welfare of the children has been the subject of serious inquiry from the com-

mencement of American Methodism to the present hour. In the Conference of 1779, five years before the organization of our Church, the question was asked, "What shall be done with the children?" The answer was given, "Meet them once a fortnight, and examine the parents with regard to their conduct toward them." We do not claim that formal Sunday-schools were at that time organized, but the Sunday-school Idea was evidently there, and to trace the growth of this Idea in our Church is the object of the present paper.

For the better illustration of our theme we divide the Sunday-school labors of our Church into five distinct historic periods:

I. The *Period of Recognition*. This begins with the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and ends with the official recognition of the Sunday-school by the Conference—a period of six years, 1784-1790.

In the first Discipline of our Church (1784) the question is asked, "What shall we do for the rising generation?" and five distinct answers are given, the first of which we quote as bearing upon our subject: "Where there are ten children whose parents are in the society, meet them at least one hour every week." In addition to this, every Preacher before being received was required to solemnly promise to diligently instruct the children in every place. Thus the Church among its first duties assumed the spiritual instruction and supervision of the children. Amid the momentous questions which came up for consideration during the ten days' session of the famous "Christinas Conference," it is pleasing to reflect that the children were not forgotten. The noble band of enterprising, vigorous, progressive young men who in the rude chapel in Lovely Lane, Baltimore, formed an ecclesiastical organization which they intended should be long-lived and useful, had the sagacity to see that in order to perpetuate the Church some spiritual provision must be made for the children, and they acted accordingly.

Two years after this, namely, in 1786, Bishop Asbury established the first Sunday-school in America, in the house of Thomas Crenshaw, in Hanover county, Virginia. One of the first converts in this school afterward became a useful minister in our Church. Not long after this other Sunday-schools were established by our ministers in different parts of the country,

and some of these godly men were beaten and otherwise abused for the interest they manifested in the spiritual welfare of the children, especially where those children were so unfortunate as to have a black skin.

In 1787 directions were given by the Conference for the formation of classes for children with a view to their graduation into the Church. The Preachers were to meet these classes weekly, or appoint suitable persons to do it. Two years later the Preachers were directed to prepare a list of the names of the children thus organized into classes.

The year 1790 is made memorable in the history of our Church by the official recognition of the Sunday-school in the Minutes of the Conferences. The question is asked, "What can be done in order to instruct poor children, white and black, to read?" This is the answer: "Let us labor, as the heart and soul of one man, to establish Sunday-schools in or near the place of public worship. Let persons be appointed by the Bishops, Elders, Deacons, or Preachers, to teach gratis all that will attend, and have a capacity to learn, from six o'clock in the morning till ten, and from two o'clock in the afternoon till six, where it does not interfere with public worship. The Council shall compile a proper school-book to teach them learning and piety."

It is to be noticed here that these Sunday-schools were not intended to supersede the children's classes already spoken of. Those were designed for "children whose parents are in society"—for "the children of our friends;" these were established for "poor children, white and black." The great object of the classes was personal piety; to this the Sunday-school added learning to read. The children's classes are frequently referred to in the Discipline after the formation of Sunday-schools.

The two sessions of four hours each on every Sunday, making eight hours in all, must have been a severe tax on the persons appointed "to teach gratis;" and, unless human nature were then more enduring, and piety more self-sacrificing, than now, we must suppose that the plan was greatly modified after a brief practical trial. We may smile now at the crude notion of the Sunday-school which was manifested in that early day; but here stands the fact prominently set forth, that the Methodist

Episcopal Church only six years after its organization, and when it numbered but 227 ministers and 57,631 members in all this land, recognized the Sunday-school as an element of moral power that was worthy of encouragement, and was the first ecclesiastical body in this country to give it recognition.

II. The *Period of Organization*, beginning with the official recognition of the Sunday-school by the Church, and closing with the time when it was made the duty of the Preachers "to form Sunday-schools"—a period of thirty-eight years: 1790-1828.

To what extent the official exhortation of 1790 was heeded we have no means of knowing, but no doubt the experiment was faithfully tried in various places. In 1796 the General Conference requested the Bishops to prepare "Annotations on the Form of Discipline." In these notes Coke and Asbury earnestly urge "the people in the cities, towns, and villages to establish Sabbath-schools wherever practicable, for the benefit of the children *of the poor*."

We find no official action on the subject of Sunday-schools from the publication of the Bishops' notes to the General Conference of 1824, a period of twenty-eight years. During a part of this term the interest in Sunday-schools languished, and many of them were given up, the teachers becoming discouraged. The recommendations in the Minutes of 1790 and in the Annotations of 1796 were, however, all this time before the Church, and in accordance with them many schools were organized in different parts of the country, there being a marked increase of the number from the year 1815 onward. Thus the Sunday-School Idea was constantly growing in the Church, slowly, it is true, compared to its growth in later times, but surely and steadily.

The General Conference of 1824 passed three resolutions on Sunday-schools: 1. It was made "the duty of each traveling Preacher in our connection to encourage the establishment and progress of Sunday-schools." 2. Arrangements were made for the compilation of a catechism "for the use of Sunday-schools and of children in general." 3. The Book Agents were instructed "to provide and keep on hand a good assortment of books suitable for the use of Sunday-schools."

It is worthy of note here that the Church had by this time

outgrown the notion that Sunday-schools were intended mainly for "the children of the poor." All limitations were taken off, and the Preachers were not simply urged, but directed, as a part of their official duty, to encourage the work of organization.

The period under consideration is still further marked by the formation of the "Sunday-School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church." This was organized in the city of New York, April 2, 1827. There were reasons which satisfied the founders of this Society that our Church could be more efficient in the Sunday-school work with an association of its own than by uniting with other denominations in a general society. They accordingly formed a denominational union whose objects should be "to promote the formation and to concentrate the efforts of Sabbath-schools connected with the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and all others that may become auxiliary; to aid in the instruction of the rising generation, particularly in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and in the service and worship of God."

This was a great improvement on the primitive Sunday-schools, whose primary object was to give instruction in the elements of secular learning, mingling such instruction with religious truth. It will be seen, however, that the Sunday-school was still regarded as a children's institution. The Idea had not yet sufficiently expanded to take in adults as students of the Bible.

At the General Conference of 1828, which met at Pittsburgh, the Sunday-school cause was considered of sufficient importance to demand a committee to look after its interests in connection with those of the Tract Societies. This conference also amended the Discipline so that it became the duty of "every Preacher of a circuit or station to form Sunday-schools." Thus for the first time the Sunday-school is referred to in the Discipline of our Church. We must not fail to notice the marked improvement in four years. In 1824 the General Conference by resolution made it the duty of each Preacher to "*encourage* the establishment and progress of Sunday-schools." In 1828 the Discipline made it the duty of every Preacher "*to form* Sunday-schools." The latter implies a greater degree of personal interest and activity than the former, and with this rule in the Discipline the Period of Organization properly closes.

III. The *Period of Development*, beginning with the time when it became the duty of the Preachers to form Sunday-schools, and closing with the time when a special editor was appointed for Sunday-school publications—a period of sixteen years: 1828-1844.

The Sunday-school began now to assume definite shape, and manifested signs of vitality and of growth that were encouraging. There was still, however, much to be done in the way of development. The Bishops, in their address to the General Conference of 1832, state that it is the opinion of many that "the Sunday-school system might be improved, and made more simple;" and they recommend the subject to the attention of the Conference. The General Conference accordingly requested the Book Agents and Editors in New York to prepare a book "in which shall be laid down, in the most simple form, the best entire system of Sunday-school teaching."

The Discipline was so amended at this Conference as to make it the duty of the Book Committee in New York to co-operate with the General Editors in the selection of Sunday-school books. It was also made the duty of the Presiding Elder to "promote" Sunday-schools, and of the Preacher in charge to report the statistics of his Sunday-schools to the last quarterly conference of the conference year, and to each annual conference.

The next General Conference (1836) gave the Bishops authority to appoint conference Sunday-school agents when requested to do so by the annual conferences.

At the General Conference of 1840 there were greater evidences of development than had before that time been seen, important amendments being made to the Discipline in reference to Sunday-school interests. It was made the duty of the Presiding Elder carefully to inquire at each quarterly conference if the rules for the instruction of children have been faithfully observed. These rules were entirely remodeled and enlarged, occupying more than two pages of the Discipline, and giving five distinct answers to the question, "What shall we do for the rising generation?" Four of these answers are devoted exclusively to Sunday-school affairs, and the fifth has reference to the personal duty of the Preachers to the children. In addition to the duties formerly devolved on the Preacher in

charge in reference to Sunday-schools, he is required by these rules "to visit the schools as often as practicable, to preach on the subject of Sunday-schools and of religious instruction in each congregation at least once in six months," and to form Bible classes "for the instruction of larger children and youth." Thus the Sunday-School Idea in its development was gradually rising from the position originally occupied. Efforts were no longer limited to young children. "Larger children and youth" were recognized as legitimate objects of Sunday-school supervision.

The year 1840 is also memorable as the time when the Sunday-School Union of our Church was reorganized. From various reasons the Society, which, as has already been noticed, was formed in 1827, had languished, and at last died. A number of brethren in the city of New York determined to make vigorous efforts for its resuscitation. They accordingly prepared a new constitution, which they sent to the General Conference, with a memorial requesting that body to give official recognition to the Union, and to indorse the constitution offered. This the General Conference did most heartily, and from that hour the Union put forth a new life which has not since languished.

The same conference also directed that the Editors of the "Christian Advocate and Journal" should edit all books for use in the Sunday-school. One result of this arrangement was the establishing in the following year, 1841, of the child's paper, which has since become widely known as "The Sunday-School Advocate."

During the session of the General Conference of 1844, in the city of New York, a Sunday-school convention met, "For the purpose of adopting measures more efficiently to advance the cause of Sabbath-school instruction throughout the Methodist Episcopal Church." This, we believe, was the first convention of the kind ever held in our Church. It sent a memorial to the General Conference recommending the creation of "a distinct and separate department for the editing and publishing of Sunday-school books." It also recommended the appointment of "a competent editor especially and solely for the Sunday-school department." It likewise requested the General Conference so to amend the Discipline as to make

Sunday-school superintendents members of the quarterly conferences."*

The last request was not granted; the Church was not yet ready for the full incorporation of the Sunday-school into its organization. The other recommendations were, however, cordially adopted, giving to the Sunday-school a new impulse, and vastly increasing its powers of usefulness; the new department being placed under the charge of the Rev. Daniel P. Kidder, D.D.

IV. The *Period of Incorporation*, beginning with the appointment of a special Sunday-school Editor, and ending with the admission of Sunday-school Superintendents to the quarterly conference—a period of twelve years: 1844-1856—including all of Dr. Kidder's administration.

Up to this time the relation of the Sunday-school to the Church had not been definitely fixed. Many regarded the Sunday-school as an institution independent of the Church, in which Church-members and others might voluntarily assume responsibility and perform labor, the Church having no special control over it, but simply patronizing it. The more thoughtful and sagacious men among clergy and laity were, however, beginning to see that the power of the Sunday-school for usefulness could not be brought up to the highest point of efficiency if the institution were suffered to remain isolated from the Church. There were those who feared that this condition of independency would lead to collisions and disputes about authority, and to other unpleasant results much to be deprecated, and inevitably detrimental to the peace of the Church and to the usefulness of the Sunday-school. Efforts were accordingly put forth to establish such a relation between the Church and Sunday-school as should give to the Church the entire control of the school, and incorporate the school into the organization of the Church. This was happily accomplished during the period under consideration.

Dr. Kidder entered upon the labors of his office with his characteristic tact and persistence. It is not germane to the design of the present paper to notice all the varied details of those labors, but we may say in passing that during the

* A full report of this convention was published in the "Christian Advocate and Journal" of May 22d, 1844.

twelve years here referred to the facilities for Sunday-school instruction were multiplied in a way that had not been before known. Large numbers of new books for study and for libraries were published, and requisites of different kinds were provided for the more complete furnishing of the schools of our Church.

The General Conference of 1840 had given to each quarterly conference the "supervision of all the Sunday-schools and Sunday-school societies within its limits;" but something more than this was needed to make an organic union between the Church and the school. There were those who thought that, while the quarterly conference, properly enough, had supervision of the school, the school ought in some way to be officially represented in the quarterly conference. Accordingly, as we have already seen, the Sunday-School Convention of 1844 requested the General Conference to make all Superintendents members *ex officio* of the quarterly conferences. This request, as before noticed, was not complied with; it was not even indorsed by the Sunday-School Committee of the General Conference.

The effort was renewed in 1848, and this time the proposition succeeded in obtaining the recommendation of the Sunday-School Committee; but the General Conference, while adopting the other suggestions of its committee, laid this one on the table. In 1852 the question was again brought before the General Conference, which body so amended the Discipline that male Superintendents, being members of our Church, were admitted to the quarterly conferences, "with the right to speak and vote on questions relating to Sunday-schools, and on such questions only."

This was a great step in advance, but the General Conference of 1856 very wisely took off the restriction above noted, and made the Superintendents members of the quarterly conferences on the same footing as other members, with power to speak and vote on all questions that may legitimately come before a quarterly conference; the only proviso being that the quarterly conference shall first approve of the appointment of the Superintendent to his office.

Thus the Sunday-school became fully incorporated into the working forces of the Church.

V. The *Period of Expansion*, beginning with the admission of Sunday-school Superintendents to the quarterly conferences, and closing with the appointment of an additional special Editor for Teachers' books and Sunday-school requisites—a period of twelve years: 1856–1868—including all of Dr. Wise's administration as Corresponding Secretary of the Sunday-School Union.

The labors of the preceding periods had not been without effect. Glorious results followed the efforts put forth by the earnest workers for Christ. The Sunday-school had steadily risen in the estimation of the Church to a high position as an agency of usefulness. It was but natural to suppose that its usefulness would increase as its real relation to the Church became understood. We accordingly find that the period under consideration gave more indications of progress than any which preceded it. This remark, however, must not be construed into any disparagement of the efforts of previous years, but rather as a compliment to those efforts, because without them we should never have seen these glorious results. They prepared the way for this expansion of the Sunday-School Idea.

The General Conference of 1860, by the addition of a single word to the Discipline, placed the Sunday-school in a higher and more prominent position than it had ever occupied. For some years it had been the duty of the Preacher in charge "to form Bible classes for the larger children and youth." The word "adults" was now added, so that the rule should read, "to form Bible classes for the larger children, youth, and adults." At first sight this might not seem to be a matter of much significance; but when we remember that for a long time the Church had looked on the Sunday-school merely as a place for children, the importance of this amendment becomes apparent, indicating, as it does, a wide step forward. The progressive steps by which this result was reached are worthy of notice. At the first, our Sunday-schools were intended for the children of the poor; next, they were arranged to include all children; after the lapse of years, "larger children and youth" were considered worthy of special mention; and at last the Idea was so expanded as to embrace adults. The theory of our Church now is that the Sunday-school is a place where all, children and adults, may study the word of God.

The same General Conference ordered "the publication of a monthly paper for the benefit of Sunday-school Teachers." This order resulted in the establishment of the "Sunday-School Journal," which has done much to promote the efficiency of our schools.

The following year, 1861, is memorable in our Sunday-school history for the introduction of a new measure which has since become widely known and used: we mean the Sunday-School Teachers' Institute. As early as 1847 Dr. Kidder, in his annual report to the Union, suggested the formation of these institutes on the plan of the "Teachers' Institutes," so popular and useful in connection with secular education. The Church, however, was not yet ready for this advance movement, and in the following year the Doctor in his report says, "We fear the day is distant when the Church will take as high ground on this subject as that assumed by several States of the Union; namely, that in order to promote general education most effectually institutions must be provided for the special instruction of teachers."

The suggestion, though for a time apparently lost sight of, was not forgotten. As the years passed by the necessity of some means by which our Sunday-school teachers might be trained for their work became more and more apparent. In October, 1860, at the session of the Rock River Conference in Chicago, the Rev. J. H. Vincent brought the subject before the Sunday-School Committee, and the committee reported to the conference that in their judgment Institutes for Sunday-school teachers were desirable. The conference unanimously adopted the report. The experiment was tried for the first time on the 17th of April, 1861, at Freeport, Illinois, in connection with the Galena District Sunday-School Convention, then in session, and was under the direction of Mr. Vincent.*

* As this was the first regularly organized Sunday-School Teachers' Institute ever held, we give its programme as a matter of historic interest:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GALENA DISTRICT SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS' INSTITUTE.—At the first meeting in Freeport, April, 1861: Wednesday, A. M., from 8 to 8.20, Devotional Services; 8.20 to 8.45, Scripture Study, (historical,) conducted by Rev. D. Casseday; 8.45 to 9.10, Drill on Order of Exercises in Sabbath-School, by Rev. C. M. Woodward; 9.10 to 9.30, Remarks on Public Examinations in Sabbath-Schools, by Rev. C. F. Wright; 9.30 to 10, Scripture Study, (doctrinal,) conducted by Rev. H. Ely.—Adjourned. Wednesday, P. M., from 2 to 2.10, Devo-

In 1864 the General Conference gave evidence of the progress which the Sunday-school was making among us by further identifying it with the Church. It invested the quarterly conferences with power to remove unworthy or inefficient Superintendents. It also made it the duty of each quarterly conference to appoint a Sunday-School Committee, the Preacher in charge to be chairman, the duties of which committee to be to aid the Sunday-school in every possible way by procuring suitable teachers, by promoting the attendance of children at Sunday-school and public worship, and by raising money for the expenses of the schools. The committee, with the Superintendent, are also to decide what books shall be used in the schools.

The demand for improvement among Sunday-school teachers increased to such an extent, that the Rev. Dr. Wise, the efficient Corresponding Secretary of the Union, who already had the work of two or three men on his hands, asked the Board of Managers in 1866 for the appointment of a General Agent who should travel throughout the country to hold institutes, and to further all the interests of the Society. The Board appointed the Rev. J. H. Vincent, of Chicago, to this office. He traveled far and wide, aroused Sunday-school teachers to efforts for improvements, held institutes, established normal classes, and in a variety of ways so demonstrated the necessity for special efforts in behalf of an elevated standard of Sunday-school education that the General Conference of 1868 created a "Department of Sunday-School Instruction," which should have supervision of all Sunday-school requisites, and of all textbooks for Sunday-schools and for Normal Classes. Mr. Vincent was appointed to the superintendency of this department, in connection with the Corresponding Secretaryship of the Union, and the office of Editor of the "Sunday-School Journal."

We have thus traced the growth of the Sunday-School Idea from the earliest history of our Church to the present time. A glance at the present position of the Sunday-school in its official relation to the Church will serve to show how great this growth has been.

tional Service; 2.10 to 2.30, Plan of conducting Teachers' Meeting, by Rev. J. McClane; 2.30 to 3, Sacred Geography—Drill conducted by G. J. Bliss; 3 to 3.30, Lecture on "Our Institute and Sub-Institutes," by Rev. J. H. Vincent.—Adjourned.

I. The Sunday-school is clearly recognized as a part of the Church.

The Sunday-School Union is organically connected with the Church by act of the General Conference. The Bishops are *ex officio* its presiding officers. Its executive officer, the Corresponding Secretary, is appointed by the General Conference, which body has also ordered that collections shall annually be taken for it in all our Churches. To this Union every Sunday-school in our Church is auxiliary.

The central authority of each Sunday-school is the quarterly conference of the Church to which it belongs. The Presiding Elder is required to ask certain questions in reference to the school, and it is the duty of the Preacher in charge to report statistical and other items in relation to it. The Superintendent is a member of the quarterly conference, and may by it be removed from office for cause. The same body appoints a committee to promote the welfare of the school.

The Pastor's duties in relation to the Sunday-school are defined by the Discipline. He is to preach on the subject of Sunday-schools at stated times; to visit the school as often as practicable; to supervise the selection of books to be used; and in every way possible to further the interests of the school.

II. Abundant provision is now made for the wants of our Sunday-schools.

There is an Editor for the "Sunday-School Advocate," for library books, and for children's publications generally, and another Editor for the "Journal," and for Teachers' text-books. There is a department of instruction specially designed to facilitate the work of teaching. Hundreds of thousands of library and text-books are furnished, as well as an immense quantity of what are known as "Sunday-school requisites." Sunday-School Institutes and Normal Classes are established for the training of teachers; and there is a uniform lesson system for all the schools in our Church, with special and efficient helps for teacher and scholar.

III. The present statistics of our Sunday-schools, according to the report published in January, 1871, will show how the Idea has grown in our Church.

We have in round numbers 17,000 schools, 190,000 officers and teachers, and 1,220,000 scholars. Of requisites, books of instruction, etc., there were published in 1870 :

Volumes (bound).....	227,934
In paper covers.....	149,412
Picture Paper.....	128,000
Picture Lesson Paper.....	403,493
Teacher's Leaf.....	118,307
Scholar's Leaf.....	266,045
Berean Lesson Leaf.....	354,483
Sunday-School Journal.....	272,485
Sunday-School Class-Book.....	21,483
Leaf Cluster.....	1,636

The total number of pages of printed matter issued in 1870 by the Department of Requisites of the Sunday-School Union is 28,237,400.

There were forty-one volumes added to our Sunday-school libraries; 489,166 library books bound; 275,212 books in paper covers, and 290,613 children's tracts. The number of printed pages in the issues was 12,235,000. The maximum circulation of the "Sunday-School Advocate" was 368,000.

Thus has God's providence led us, until we find grown up in the Church an institution whose power of usefulness it is difficult to estimate. We have not, however, seen the perfect development of which the Sunday-School Idea is capable; and while it is proper for us to rejoice over the progress already made, it is also well for us to see in what direction there can be further improvement. There is a general consciousness that we need a higher grade of teaching than we have had in the past. Common school facilities are constantly increasing, and care must be taken that there be not too marked a contrast between the style of teaching our children receive during the week, and that which they get on the Sabbath. This reflection ought not to bring discouragement to any right-minded person who desires to do good in the Sunday-school, for the facilities for self-improvement now offered to Sunday-school teachers are such that pious persons of ordinary good sense, though having but little culture, can by determined perseverance become qualified for the duties to be performed.

We also need a more general practical acceptation by the

Church of the principle, already recognized theoretically and formally, that the Sunday-school is not a mere independent voluntary association, but an essential part of the Church organization. When this truth is recognized as it ought to be, every member of the Church will feel that his solemn Church covenant binds him to an active participation in some way with the Sunday-school. There are a few Churches, we believe, where the members are all engaged in the Sunday-school either as scholars or teachers. As the Idea continues to grow, the number of such Churches will increase. Every member of the Church should also feel it to be his duty to contribute to the necessary expenses of the school, and these expenses ought to be regarded as a part of the necessary expenses of the Church, and provided for as all other Church expenses are.

There is also needed a constant spirit of consecration to the work, and never failing spirituality on the part of the workers. We do not share the fears expressed by some, that the progressive movements in our Sunday-schools during the last few years may result in higher attainments in biblical knowledge at the expense of vital piety. We see no reason for these fears while our Sunday-School Conventions and Institutes are characterized by their present deep tone of spirituality; nevertheless, if we would keep the standard to its present height we must have perpetually before us the need of an intimate spiritual relationship to Christ, and the necessity of a constant presentation of the Saviour to the school. A Christless Sunday-school will inevitably produce disastrous results.

The signs for the future are hopeful. We think there is a deep meaning in the general awakening in the mind of the Church to the importance of the Sunday-school movement. There is significance in the anxious desire so frequently and so freely expressed by our Sunday-school laborers, for the means of greater efficiency in their work. What is to be the peculiar characteristic of the historic period of Sunday-school labor on which we have now entered can only be known when the lapse of years shall develop some marked event which shall indicate its close. We should have great reason for joy if we thought it might truthfully be called the *Period of Realization*; the period when the great ideal of the true Sunday-school should

be reached. All devout hearts should labor and pray that the Church may become a thinking, Bible-studying Church; a Church built up in Christ by faith in him, and by a diligent study of his divine word. Then will the Sunday-School Idea be fully realized.

ART. V.—ARTS OF INTOXICATION.

Arts of Intoxication: The Aim, and the Results. By Rev. J. T. CRANE, D.D. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

TEMPERANCE literature is becoming extensive, and, though apt to be somewhat monotonous, it is always interesting. This literature has three elements of great power to secure attention—economy, comedy, and tragedy; and nowhere else is there a better theater for their combination and exposition, for vivid delineation and dramatic illustration.

These elements of interest have been used and applied during a third of a century with increasing force and skill. Comic orators and writers have amused the people with representations of the grotesque effects of intemperance. Books and newspaper serials have done with the pen what Hogarth did with the pencil in his "Rake's Progress;" and the successive steps from the gay, social glass, down to a broken fortune and a desolated family, have often been portrayed with fidelity and power. The injury which intemperance inflicts on the finances of the State, on the morals of the people, and on the bodies and minds of its victims and their offspring, have often been clearly and forcibly expounded. But while these powerful arguments and touching recitals have stirred the feelings, and awakened inquiries and earnest desires for the suppression of intemperance, they have failed in many cases to remove an injurious indecision of judgment and of purpose, because of conflicting ideas which have prevailed respecting the operation and effect, and the proper uses, of the intoxicating agent.

Yet these endeavors of the friends of temperance have not been unavailing. They have exerted directly a vast moral effect on the community at large—promoting a fuller and deeper comprehension of the subject of temperance, more union of sentiment among its friends, more firmness of attitude and

recognized moral force. The "Arts of Intoxication" is the latest product of this growing intelligence and power of the temperance party. It is a Nilometer which shows the highest point to which the tide of thought has risen in this direction. It brings into full relief and definite outline an idea or principle toward which scientific opinion has for some time been tending—the only principle, we believe, that will explain all the phenomena of intoxication.

The title of the book introduces into the world of letters a new phrase, which will probably never pass from our literature till intoxication itself is numbered among the lost arts. It aptly embodies the original conception that intoxication is an art—a black art—and that in all ages it has been pursued as an art, as a combination of contrivances for an end. This is shown in the first chapter, which gives an account of the historic origin of intemperance. A beverage was prepared by Helen, the inconstant Greek beauty, the effects of which are minutely described by Homer, and answer exactly to the intoxication of modern times, and the mode of preparing it is mentioned as a valuable secret. The original discovery was doubtless accidental; but, so far as history gives us light, the preparation of intoxicants has been pursued as an art in all ages.

This implies that intoxication is a source of pleasure; it can be sought for only on this assumption. It may give pleasure either by dispelling care or destroying pain, or by originating peculiar sensations and emotions. In varying proportions and degrees it does all these. Its pleasurable effects are more striking in some conditions and on some constitutions than others; but these are the ends sought in all the subjects and in all degrees of inebriety.

In the second chapter the mysterious connection between mind and body is expounded in a style that deserves to be called classic. The intoxicant is material, and is received into the body; yet while it intoxicates the body it also intoxicates the spirit. Body and mind are in sympathy, and the effects on both are similar. If either is exhilarated, both are exhilarated. If either is stupefied, both are stupefied. The intoxicant is, therefore, taken for the sake of its effects both on the body and mind; and sometimes the mind, and sometimes the body, is primarily sought to be affected. The orator, the poet, and the

humorist may have recourse to it on the assumption that it will help them in their task; or the unfortunate and the wretched may resort to it to relieve their sorrows; and the worn laborer and the weary traveler may also use it for its supposed tonic effect.

In analyzing the physiological and psychological effects of the various intoxicants which have been used by mankind, it is shown that, while there is specific variety, the essential property is in all the same, that this is intoxication, and that this effect is the main end that is invariably sought—not the pleasures of the palate, which are always subordinate, but the pleasures of intoxication. A further analysis shows that all these intoxicants are poisonous, and that intoxication in all cases, whatever be the form of the intoxicant, is a process of poisoning. This is exhibited in an interesting account of the popular use, as intoxicants, of the coca-leaf, thorn-apple, the betel-nut, opium, and hemp.

The author gives three chapters on the history, the poisonous operation, and the wrong use of tobacco. His treatment of this subject is in every respect excellent. Taken all in all, we know nothing elsewhere that equals it.

Few of the devotees of tobacco have an idea of the power of the drug, or how heavy is the hand which it lays upon them, how far it goes into the depths of their being. The writer once tested the pulse of a clerical friend sitting quietly in his parlor puffing a cigar, and found that in the space of a quarter of an hour the pulsations had increased from seventy-four to eighty-six in the minute. In the case of another clerical friend, smoking a pipe in a moderate way, the pulse rose from seventy to eighty-five within thirty minutes. In neither case, so far as I could see, was there any thing but the narcotic to cause the acceleration. In both cases, also, the pulse fell off in force, while it increased in frequency.—Page 70.

Some abusers of the weed will deny that it is an intoxicant; but their denial is vain. Dr. Crane is evidently no smoker, but there are plenty of witnesses to the truth of his description who are or have been smokers—chiefly the latter. Those who still continue the practice are naturally reluctant to inculpate themselves; while those who have repented, and brought forth fruit meet for repentance, are necessarily willing, on all proper occasions, to confess their former sin. In fidelity to truth some

of us are compelled to confess that the effect of tobacco, though specifically different from that of alcohol, and of a milder type, is generically the same. Both are intoxicants. We have ourselves used it for this effect, and we know that this has been the object of others in its use, even in the pulpit. Liquor they abhorred, but this they considered innocent and safe. We have also heard old "snuff dippers" describe their experience. They have confessed to us that they were so narcotized, not sickened, that it was only with effort that they could walk steadily, and they have even lain down to sleep off the effect.

The author contends that tobacco is a destroyer of intellectual social intercourse.

Note the progress of things at some little gathering of friends for an evening's entertainment. Before supper, and at the table, how animated the conversation, how full of mind, wit, humor, intelligence, force. There is a steady rise in the interest and mental enjoyment, till the time comes when the host, knowing the habits of his guests, deems it polite to invite them to another room and offer them cigars. From that moment every thing declines, the mental interest and pleasure die out, the company tend to silence, or utter speech which is no improvement on silence, and the affair is over.

The celebrated Bautain of France has, in a public lecture, given utterance to a similar sentiment.

This is surely and obviously true. Tobacco separates the sexes in social gatherings, and thus represses at once the operations of the finer instincts and promptings of our nature, and the aroma of social intercourse has departed. It is this among other causes that make women its born foes. It is a foe to their sex, and to all their instincts of neatness and purity.

It is admitted that in social life tobacco helps to put some men at their ease. But who? Only those who lack conversational power. And how does it do this? Only by deadening their sensibilities. But in so doing it takes away the incitement to make an earnest effort at conversation. They are made contented with smoke and dreamy silence.

It is further argued against tobacco that its use is wholly artificial, without any foundation in natural wants. Some think that because we like it there must be a reason for it in our constitution. But this argument proves too much, because the more we supply this supposed natural want, the greater

the want and the more imperious the demand—a result which is contrary to the law of natural need and supply. If the love of tobacco is a normal taste, and its existence proves its right to be, then it should be indulged till it is duly satisfied, like hunger and thirst. But this cannot be done, since uniform increase up to constant indulgence is the law of its demand, if complied with at all. Besides, we cannot discover any good end that it serves, while such an end is very obvious in all undisputed natural appetites. The strongest men, and classes and tribes of men, have never used either tobacco or any other narcotic, as Samson, the Roman soldiers, the Brahmins of India. So the lower animals are never known to eat the natural narcotics which are found in their range.

But if we cannot discover any beneficial end that it serves, we can readily see that it is the source of much evil. It is a filthy thing, and a public nuisance. The chewer cannot open his mouth without showing that it is "full of all uncleanness," and often when shut the evidence is not less clear and repulsive. "Such men ought to herd by themselves, and when they travel ride in the cattle train."

It is also shown that it debilitates both body and mind. This was so evident among the students at Paris a few years ago that the emperor forbade them to use it. It destroys health and even life, prepares the way for stronger narcotics, is a great waste of pecuniary resources, and tends to become a fixed tyrannical habit, so that to begin to use it is unwise and even dangerous.

The discussion of the alcoholic poison very properly occupies more than half the volume. It is in the discussion of this that the author develops the distinguishing feature of the book—the physiological principle that all intoxicants are anaesthetics. It is this part, therefore, which demands our chief attention. The previous chapters are excellent, but these on alcohol have a deeper practical interest, and furnish in full exposition the philosophy for all.

We are first presented with a chapter on the production and history of alcohol, in which the admitted facts on the subject are epitomized. Alcohol may be generated by fermentation in all substances containing sugar or its chemical equivalent, and it may then be concentrated or purified by distillation—a

process which was not discovered till the thirteenth century. By this process the alcohol may be separated from any fermented liquor, which then ceases to be drinkable, for it is equally repulsive to the natural taste of a sober man and the abnormal taste of a drunkard. Distill the alcohol from any toper's favorite beverage and the residue becomes disgusting to him, showing that it is the alcohol that he wants. It is this only which gives attraction to our domestic wines as well as to all others. Distill wine, beer, or cider at a temperature that will carry off with the alcohol a certain proportion of the flavored water, and we now have "spirituous liquor," which is the same beverage with a greater proportion of alcohol, and it is, therefore, pronounced the best, since in either state alcohol is all that gives it attraction.

We then have a chapter on the Delusions of Alcohol, which are described as charming while they last, but their charm is of a debasing and vulgar order.

And herein lies the fatal power of the whole list of intoxicants. They are cheats, impostors, mockers. They exalt men to a high state of mental enjoyment which has no foundation in reason or reality. He who is fully under their influence may be happy after a fashion; but his enjoyment is based upon a mockery. He feels like a giant while he is really shorn of his natural force. He drivels the veriest nonsense, while he thinks he reasons better than Plato.—Page 145.

We have next a chapter on the true effect of alcohol. This is the most important portion of the volume. This chapter will inevitably excite discussion and elicit thought, and if its leading principle is true, it is destined to effect a great change in the sentiment and usage of society.

We are informed that three French scientists of distinguished rank, M. Perrin, M. Lallemand, and M. Duroy, after pursuing the investigation for years, sum up the result in the following seven formal statements: 1, That alcohol is not food; 2, that in small doses it is an excitant, but in large doses a stupefiant; 3, that it is neither changed nor destroyed in the human organism; 4, that it accumulates in the brain and liver; 5, that through the lungs, skin, and kidneys it is eliminated from the human organism unchanged in nature and undiminished in quantity; 6, that it has a direct and serious disease-producing

operation ; 7, that spirituous liquors derive from alcohol their common properties and their special effect.

Our author shows from an extensive induction that intoxication, in all its stages, is a partial paralysis of the brain. Eminent medical authorities are quoted in support of the principle, and the truth of it is shown in detail by the following facts : That *alcohol diminishes animal heat*, and, by lowering the tone of the body, lessens its power to resist either heat or cold ; that it *diminishes muscular strength*, which follows from diminished *vital heat* and is proved by independent experiments, so that athletes always abstain from it ; that it *disturbs the action of the senses*, which needs no proof, yet properly receives it with both gravity and humor, the author pointing us to Burns's confessed inability when drunk to count the horns of the moon, and to the strict abstinence of all who are about to perform delicate operations, as surgeons and tight-rope dancers ; that it *disturbs the mental action*, banishing cool judgment, clear perception, and delicate self-poise ; that it *wars with moral self-control*, unseating reason and benumbing the conscience, so that the lower passions, left to themselves, often run riot, and sometimes commit all manner of folly and crime ; that its apparent power to excite and exhilarate is only a consequence of its narcotic operation, which lulls caution and the keen sense of propriety, and the excessive anxiety for success or fear of failure ; and hence, by dulling the sense of pain and the perception of risk or danger, it gives an apparent courage and fortitude, which are only apparent.

Dr. Christison, a high authority on both sides of the Atlantic, says : "The sedative action of alcohol on the brain constitutes it a powerful narcotic poison." Dr. Anstie, of London, has reached "one distinct conclusion, the importance of which appears to be very great ; namely, that, as in the case of chloroform and ether, the symptoms which are commonly described as an evidence of excitement are in reality an essential part of the narcotic, that is, the paralytic influence. This palsy of the brain is responsible for all the so-called mental excitement." Thus he denies that alcohol ever stimulates either body or mind, and affirms that it dulls every power it touches from the first to the last moment of its operation—that "the so-called mental excitement" is itself paralysis.

Dr. Davis says that "alcohol diminishes the sensibility of the brain and nervous system in the same manner as other anaesthetics." This gentleman's report of his experiment, proving that alcohol diminishes vital heat, is also quoted by our author; and this report is again supported by Professor Bing, of the University of Bonn, in Prussia, who affirms that "the heat of the body is always lowered by alcohol."

With this diminution of heat the pulse always falls off in force. We are therefore prepared for the declaration of Sir J. Richardson, an eminent northern explorer: "I am quite satisfied that spirituous liquors diminish the power of resisting cold." On this ground alcohol is forbidden to the Russian soldiers on the eve of a long march in cold weather. And as only a vigorous vitality can resist heat as well as cold, so alcohol is just as injurious in excessive heat as in excessive cold. Hence Sir Charles Napier addressed to his regiment at Calcutta the following emphatic utterance: "Let me tell you that you are come to a country where if you drink you are dead men." This was the sentiment also of the gallant Havelock.

That alcohol diminishes muscular strength is supported by Drs. Chambers and Brinton, of England, and by MM. Lallemand and Perrin, of France. But while this is the latest and ripest conclusion of science it has been the verdict of all ages. Not only the athletes of Greece, but the prize-fighters and racers of our own day abstain from it. E. P. Weston, the famous walker, holds that "the use of intoxicating liquors is not only unnecessary, but wholly injurious," in performing his feats.

That alcohol diminishes the discriminating power of the senses and of the intellect when a man is visibly intoxicated is sufficiently obvious; but it stands to reason that a small dose of the drug will, in its degree, operate in the same way. We know from experience and self-inspection that this is true. The domestic wines which the writer of this article has been induced to taste a few times in his life have given him sufficient proof of this. Our author adduces other testimony of like kind, and also of a physician who, in consequence of a small dose which produced no outward sign of inebriety, found himself incapable of the nice observation requisite to obtain a proper diagnosis of a patient whom he visited in that state. This is,

therefore, becoming one of the settled conclusions of medical science.

Dr. Brinton, in his work on Dietetics, writes: "Mental acuteness, accuracy of perception, and delicacy of the senses, are all so far opposed by alcohol that the maximum efforts of each are incompatible with the injection of any *moderate* quantity of fermented liquid. A single glass will often suffice to take the edge off both mind and body, and to reduce their capacity to something below their perfection of work." For twenty years Professor Davis, in his lectures at the Medical College at Chicago, has taught the doctrine that "alcohol is simply an anæsthetic, a sedative to nervous sensibility, and debilitating to all the physical functions." It differs from ether and chloroform in being a little more durable in its effect, doubtless because it cannot escape from the system as rapidly as they. This fact is acted on continually. Men often take a heavy draught of some alcoholic liquor when they are about to have a tooth extracted, or undergo any other painful operation, whether of body or mind. Its anæsthetic agency is thus practically and widely recognized and acknowledged.

Nor does alcohol greatly differ from some other anæsthetics in the exhilaration which attends it. One of them produces so powerful and striking an effect of this kind that it is called laughing gas; and this high and strange exhilaration, so far from being considered a proof that it is a stimulant and not an anæsthetic, is acknowledged to be one of the symptoms of narcosis. It is always attended by enfeeblement of the intellect and the sensibilities. The same is equally true of alcoholic exhilaration. Dr. Anstie tested the effect of a small dose of alcohol on himself, "and in a very few minutes found his pulse beating more rapidly, felt a degree of numbness in his lips, and was conscious of a confusion of thought."

But there are some facts which are supposed to prove that alcohol is a true stimulant, and these will be adduced in opposition to the doctrine of this book. Our author replies that, while alcohol is in no true sense a stimulus either to mind or body, yet where these have become disordered and diseased by indulgence they cannot work as well without it until the habit is conquered and the disease removed, but that they can never work as well with it as they would have done had it never been

used. A second answer is that, as alcohol lulls caution, dulls sensibility and the keen sense of propriety and the power of acute criticism, it makes its debased and cheated victim very self-complacent, so that while he feels very free and energetic he is simply reckless, and his judgment is unhinged and his wit is invariably of a coarser grain, and sometimes ludicrously contemptible, if not something worse. A third answer is given to the effect that, notwithstanding the too common assumption that alcohol is a mental stimulant, there is at the same time a truer and deeper feeling to the contrary, so that we listen to drunken wit "in something of the same frame of mind with which we witness the performances of 'the learned pig' or the feats of the 'educated mules.'"

It is also pertinently inquired how this agent can at once stimulate the mind and drown trouble. That it does the latter all are agreed, and that it does this by stupefaction cannot be denied. How then can it stimulate at the same time? The supposition is self-contradictory. Wine is described in Scripture as deadening and exhilarating, but never as stimulating. Drink it, and "they have stricken me, shalt thou say, and I was not sick; they have beaten me, and I felt it not." "Give wine unto those that be of heavy heart. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more." "Merry with wine." It exhilarates by deadening the senses and the judgment. It gives no particle of strength anywhere; but to the deluded victim it amounts to the same for the time being, and afterward there is a heavy price to pay for the delusive enjoyment.

But allowing that the direct operation of alcohol is always sedative and deadening, is it not sometimes a real and practical stimulant indirectly? It must be admitted on this theory that when a man is in good health and spirits, and assured of being equal to his situation, the effect of alcohol must be a diminution of his force. But if he is chilled, and repressed by an ungenial moral and social atmosphere, or somewhat cowed by the dominant bearing of an adversary, or by the presence of a keen, unfriendly critic, or if he is in low spirits because of some misfortune or bad news, so that he cannot "be himself," cannot bring his powers into full exercise, nor make his resources available, then alcohol by deadening his sensibilities can make him

despise his adversaries and hostile critics, and be practically oblivious of all his sorrows and misfortunes, and his mind can operate to more advantage apparently, and perhaps with more real effect. By taking alcohol he is really stupefied, but he is also enlivened. His susceptibilities and his intellectual power are absolutely diminished, but their available value is really increased. He has actually less of soul and mind, but he seems to have more, because they reveal themselves better. Relative, therefore, to their immediate outward effects, alcohol, even on this theory, may operate indirectly as an aid, because in some circumstances and subjective conditions a man is able to make more of himself by its use than without. As our author admits, it may "utter the magic sesame which bids the rocky doors of the cave open, and reveal something of the wealth already gathered there."

Now this in many cases is all that is sought in its use. Many men are confident that there is mental wealth enough in them, but to get it out, "that's the question." Whoever is not self-possessed in public, whoever is too ambitious for his powers of execution, or who from any cause whatever thinks he cannot otherwise exert himself to full effect, whether in public or private, has here a temptation to use the drug for no other purpose than to reveal the assumed rock-fended treasures. This temptation remains, though our author's position is correct.

What advantage, then, have we gained by this principle? Have we gained all that reason and philosophy call for on the subject? or do we want an argument universally applicable, so clear, so strong, that in all situations and conditions it removes or destroys the power of temptation? This is impossible; it is contrary to the constitution of nature. God has made some things which can give pleasure or temporary advantage while they injure us, and these necessarily form a temptation to our ruin through the part of our nature to which they appeal. This is not only a fact of nature, but also a moral necessity. Temptation, probation, and moral agency are inseparable.

It is no small advantage to have a clear and definite knowledge of the nature of intoxication, or the physiological and psychological operation of the intoxicating agent. Having attained the true philosophy of it, we are better able to trace

and measure its subordinate effects, and to judge accurately why and when to use it, with a full knowledge alike of its good and evil. We now know that it is only by stupefaction that it can afford relief to the body or exhilaration to the mind, and when we use it we must calculate the whole effect. In certain pathological conditions any anaesthetic may operate beneficially by deadening parts which are morbidly active; but it is thus serviceable only when there is a concurrence of certain abnormal conditions. Hence, the use of alcohol as a steady regimen for body or mind, or for any chronic ailment, is precluded, and whenever it is rightly used it is primarily for its anaesthetic property. Where there is no call for this property there is no call for alcohol.

This is certainly a great step forward, scientifically and morally. Its prospective advantage is incalculable. Let this be universally received as a fixed principle of science, and it will vastly change the practice of medicine. It must have a great influence on the usages of society when all are convinced that alcohol is a real stupefier of every brighter power of mind and heart. Every thinking man, who is not already its slave, must be superior to its allurements as an alleged quickener of the brain when he has become fully aware that its claim is a lie, and its operation a universal and unmitigated cheat. Henceforth men will begin to see more and more clearly, that if alcohol ever quickens a brain it is the maudlin's brain, whose product will be more or less maudlin; and that the purest conceptions and the noblest style can never be the product of an alcoholic brain.

Dr. Crane is not the first to call alcohol an anaesthetic. As he himself shows, this has been done before by scientists from whom he derives part of his proofs. But the prevailing impressions have been vague and conflicting, and as a consequence the truth in them has been less effective. Dr. Crane has the merit of giving us a consistent and scientific exposition. We now know that alcohol is always primarily and directly an anaesthetic only, and that it can operate as a tonic or exhilarant only anaesthetically, and in certain abnormal conditions. This is to be the rule of the "coming man."

It will be found on examination and comparison that all theories of the physiological and psychological operation of

alcohol, so far as they are true, find their expression in the principle advocated in this volume. It reconciles the conflicting impressions of its being an apparent stimulant and yet a narcotic, and shows their mutual relation. James Parton has advanced a new theory, or rather given us a new formula, that "it enables us to violate the laws of nature without immediate suffering and speedy destruction." This is sometimes true, not always, and it is otherwise very defective as a comprehensive formula. It is no sooner brought forth than it is swallowed up by the formula of our author, just as the Egyptian rod-serpents were swallowed up by that of Moses.

We have given so much space to the discussion of this chapter because it is the most original and important in the volume.

Six chapters follow, which discuss with force and unexceptionable taste the various social, economical, and moral aspects of the general subject of intemperance, closing with a chapter on remedial measures.

The style of the author is worthy of very high commendation. It is perfectly transparent; it is free from hackneyed phrases, and every-where reveals a mind as genial as it is solid. To read this volume is alike recreation and instruction. It has no dull pages or paragraphs. Narrative and argument alike beguile the reader's attention, and command his approval. Even the most labored demonstration is equally easy and clear. Our article shall conclude with the author's last paragraph, which aims to dispel a selfish indisposition to earnest temperance endeavors.

Fighting hand to hand, foot to foot, with this powerful foe, we must contend for the nation's life, and suffer defeat, or gain at the best a hard won victory. And the saddest thought of all is that there should be among those who ought to be foremost in the action so much reluctance to act, so much apathy in regard to the ruin wrought before their very eyes. We are like the dwellers in a lofty mansion built on some dangerous coast where frequent wrecks occur. Darkness and storm may be without, but we are safe, and full of peace and comfort within. A ship crowded with passengers is going to pieces among the rocks, and we know it. We see the red flash of the alarm-guns, and hear the booming signal that death is at work and help is needed. But we are safe. We look around at the circle of loved ones; we glance at the cheerful fire, the table, the books, the pictured walls. Yes, we are safe. Faintly amid the roar of the winds and the sea we hear imploring

voices, but we are safe. We sing our evening song of praise, we say our evening prayer. We retire to our beds and fall asleep to the sound of storm and surf, and imploring voices still more faintly heard; while all through the night, one after another, men, women, and little innocent children are dropping, dropping from the icy wreck, and the busy waves are piling the dead along the shore under our very windows.—Pp. 262-264.

ART. VI.—THE LIFE OF TRUST.

“THE LIFE OF TRUST,” by George Müller, written by himself, is a curious book, which has been now several years before the American public, and has, very naturally and reasonably, attracted the notice of multitudes of Christian people. The work purports to be a narrative of “the Lord’s dealings” with the author, and the American edition was edited by Rev. H. L. Wayland, accompanied with an introduction by his father, the late Rev. Dr. Wayland, wherein that great and good man clearly records his indorsement of the book, and concludes as follows: “We commend this most unpretending of narratives to the thoughtful consideration of Christians of all denominations. We have greatly overrated the teaching of these facts if they do not furnish strong incentives to *a life of holy exertion, and impart an unwonted and powerful motive to earnest and believing prayer.*”

This book comprises a full and minute account of what its title sets forth, *a life of trust*—trust sincere, firm, and unfailing in God and in his “exceeding great and precious promises.” It is not a presentation of such a trust as is merely occasional and intermittent, but a trust that was daily, hourly, constant and wakeful like the breath, ever leaning, ever reposing, ever asking, ever receiving; and hence it furnishes to us one of the finest and most striking illustrations we have ever seen of that remarkable Scripture teaching us to “be careful for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.”

Mr. Müller is a Russian by birth, born near Halberstadt

in 1805. He grew up a wayward youth, giving much trouble and vexation to his father, who, however, went to very considerable expense for his education. Amid all the irregularities and sinful practices of his youth he seems to have made commendable proficiency in his studies, and was well versed in the ancient and modern languages. When about twenty years of age he gave himself more fully than before to serious thoughts and a correct conduct, and before he had completed his education at Halle he had become a very decided Christian, deeply imbued with the spirit of a missionary, and was much exercised in respect to engaging in foreign missionary labors. In 1829, and when twenty-four years of age, he passed over to England; and shortly after reaching London he received information of a certain dentist who had relinquished a profitable business yielding him about \$6,000 a year, with the intention of going, with his family, as a missionary to Persia, "simply trusting in the Lord for temporal supplies." This intelligence produced a deep impression upon the mind of Müller, and, we may presume, aided in giving a coloring to his whole subsequent career.

On coming to England, Mr. Müller gave special attention to studies preparatory to the ministry; and in the course of such studies he relates that he came, at length, to lay aside almost every other book, and gave himself to simply reading and studying the word of God. "The result of this was," said he, "that the first evening that I shut myself into my room to give myself to prayer and meditation over the Scriptures, I learned more in a few hours than I had done during a period of several months previously. *But the particular difference was that I received real strength for my soul in doing so.*"

He now began to preach as a sort of independent minister of the Gospel; for it seemed not, somehow, to accord with the genius of this man, or, at least, with his ideas of pure and simple faith in God, to attach himself to any existing religious organization or Church. With him, beyond most men of whom we have read or heard, the Lord Christ was all in all. He seemed to distrust all and every intervening agency. He shrank from any earthly Bishop, or Presbytery, or ecclesiastical counsel or guidance. He sought to draw nigh to God, and coveted to deal with him alone, and commune with him "face to face."

Mr. Müller presently entered upon a regular course of ministry at Teignmouth, where he had been invited to settle. Here he had, at first, received a regular salary, though a very limited amount; yet, small as it was, he soon reached the conclusion that it was wrong for him to labor in the ministry for any specific salary whatever, but that it was incumbent upon him to look to the Lord for such a provision as he might incline one and another of those to whom he ministered to contribute for his maintenance. For receiving these contributions a permanent box was placed in the chapel, and all desirous of aiding in the minister's support deposited here their offerings.

In the spring of 1832 Mr. Müller, after much consideration and prayer for the divine direction, removed to Bristol with a view of exercising his ministry there. Before and after leaving Teignmouth he seems to have been associated with a Mr. Craik, a gentleman of like spirit with himself; and at the end of two years' labor at Bristol, with moderate success, they were led to establish a Missionary Society on principles more in harmony with his peculiar views of trust *in God alone* than what he conceived to be the character of existing associations for missionary effort. A part of these principles was that the contributions of unconverted persons should neither be asked nor rejected if offered, that the help of this class of persons should not be allowed in managing the affairs of the association, and that the society should never incur any debt. Its scope included Sunday-schools, day-schools managed on scriptural principles, circulation of the Scriptures and tracts, and direct aid to missionary efforts proper. The sequel will show the progress and results of this undertaking.

The idea of another enterprise of charity and benevolence was presently revolving in the mind of Mr. Müller, and that was the establishment of a house and home for destitute orphan children, with a view of providing for the temporal necessities of this class of children, and of training them, by the aid of suitable assistants, "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." The enterprise seems to have been suggested to his mind by the celebrated orphan establishment of Franke at Halle. "This evening," he writes, "I took tea at a sister's house, where I found Franke's Life. I have frequently for a long time thought

of laboring in a similar way on a much smaller scale, not to imitate Franke, but in reliance upon the Lord." Who may estimate (the thought is old and trite, but will bear repeating) the influence of one little book, or even of a single page thereof! And how true, as well as wonderful, that a single good seed from the sower's hand may, under a gracious Providence, spring up to a mighty growth!

An orphan house is determined upon by Mr. Müller, and it was to be founded and sustained upon the one great principle of *simple trust in a faithful God*. The plan comprised three prominent ideas:

1. A provision for the temporal and spiritual wants of destitute orphan children.

2. The securing of this provision not by the ordinary process of soliciting charitable aid, whether publicly or privately, from any human being, but by direct and trustful appeals to God alone for all needful funds and every requisite appliance.

3. Thirdly, the establishment thus of a visible and tangible monument and demonstration of the unchanged faithfulness of God in his prompt and direct answers to fervent and believing prayer.

This last, indeed, was the principal and favorite idea, and to this all other ideas were subordinate. "This, then," said Mr. M., "was the primary reason for establishing the orphan house. I certainly did from my heart desire to be used by God to benefit the bodies of poor children bereaved of both parents, and seek in other respects, with the help of God, to do them good for this life. I also particularly longed to be used by God in getting the dear orphans trained up in the fear of God; but still the first and primary object of the work was, and still is, that God might be magnified by the fact that the orphans under my care are provided with all they need only by *prayer and faith*, without any one being asked by me or my fellow-laborers, whereby it may be seen that God is *faithful still and hears prayer still*."

In the same connection Mr. Müller further remarks:

All these exercises of my soul which resulted from the fact that so many believers with whom I became acquainted were harassed and distressed in mind, or brought guilt on their consciences, on account of "not trusting in the Lord," were used by God to awaken

in my heart the desire of setting before the Church at large, and before the world, a proof that he has not in the least changed, and this seemed to me best done by the establishing of an orphan house. It needed to be something which could be seen even by the natural eye. Now if I, a poor man, simply by prayer and faith, obtained, *without asking any individual*, the means for establishing and carrying on an orphan house, there would be something which, with the Lord's blessing, might be instrumental in strengthening the faith of the children of God, besides being a testimony to the consciences of the unconverted of the reality of the things of God.

At length the first actual step is taken—a public meeting; not for material aid, but “as a means of ascertaining more clearly the Lord's mind concerning the matter.” Then, one evening, amid his Scripture reading occur the curious words, “Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it!” Simultaneously with this the “orphan house” looms up, and out goes a petition for the suitable premises—a petition for a thousand pounds for the suitable edifice, and a petition for the suitable assistants to take care of the children. Great requests these, and striking deeply at the very roots of the matter, and grasping beforehand the grand accomplishment. Faith is already at work—the same faith which “is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen” as yet.

Two days afterward a shilling is received for the orphan house—the first shilling! In two days more appear a piece of furniture, ten shillings, and a proffered assistant. On the morrow a brother and sister offer themselves and their substance, while, in the evening, sundry articles of table furniture make their appearance. Other like articles follow speedily, together with \$250 in cash from an unexpected source. Meantime prayer goes on, and faith is awake, and constant as the recurring days are the offerings—offerings of weekly money subscriptions, of furniture, of provisions, of personal services, of clothes, and every sort of household goods. More strangely still, an offering of \$500 comes from one who with her needle was earning her daily bread, and whose average gain was from two to five shillings per week. Being remonstrated with by Mr. M. as having given unduly, she responds, “The Lord has given his *last* drop of blood for me, and should I not give him this hundred pounds?”

Such was the process, and such the success; and eighteen months after the commencing efforts the orphan house opened its hospitable doors, and seventeen children entered there to be cared for in body and in soul. There had been no soliciting for a single penny. Good men and women abounded, and generous hands were not wanting to proffer any aid for the asking; but there were no petitions for human help, not a solitary solicitation save those requests that were "made known unto God."

As time went on this enterprise was constantly extending itself. The orphan children applying for admission multiplied, as also the children of the day-schools, which, as we have seen, had been already established. The earliest accommodations for the orphans were rented premises, but it was not long before more suitable and permanent fixtures came to be a necessity.

The change from rented premises for the accommodation of the orphans to premises that should be the property of the institution forms a conspicuous era in this singular enterprise. After ten years of such efforts and success as above alluded to this change took place, and the new premises, edifice, furniture, every thing, were the fruits, pure and simple, of the same prayer of faith. For four hundred and forty-seven successive days was this prayer offered for the requisite means; and during these days, in different sums ranging from a few pence to two thousand pounds, £9,285 had been received—received without a single application to any one for help except God alone. Then the building arose and was finished, and, by succeeding donations, was furnished completely; and at the end of three years and seven months from the day when the first prayer was offered for the gift of the new premises and accommodations, one hundred and forty persons—children and assistants—passed in thither and occupied them, while the sum of \$2,500 was, at the same time, on deposit for the maintenance and instruction of the orphans.

As this great enterprise of the erection of the orphan house was approaching completion, and when a large sum of money would still be necessary for the requisite furniture and fixtures, and for which amount of money the prayer of faith was daily ascending, a gentleman approached Mr. Müller, and, after a

few minutes' conversation, placed in his hands two thousand pounds, (\$10,000,) with "permission to use it for the fitting up and furnishing of the new orphan house, or for any thing else needed in connection with the orphans."

Thus a great work had been executed, and such a work as would doubtless have satisfied many a good man to have accomplished. But Mr. Müller seemed hardly confident that all was done which was either necessary or possible. Three hundred orphans had been provided for, but applications were constantly made for others who could not be accommodated. Thousands of this class were scattered through the country, many of them confined in prisons to preserve them from starvation, while the public provision for these unfortunate children was inadequate, as well as, in many instances, unsuitable. The benevolent spirit of George Müller was stirred within him as he contemplated so much destitution and suffering. He had already done a great and good work for the aid and welfare of a multitude. In the prosecution of such a work he had gained a valuable experience in this sphere of benevolence. God had wonderfully helped him in such an enterprise. Through the Divine co-operation three hundred were already provided for; why, with the same aid and co-operation, might not a thousand be housed, clothed, fed, and educated as well as three hundred?

So reasoned this man; and he presently began to pray and trust, as well as to reason, just as he had before prayed in behalf of the orphan house, now completely filled. The idea grew upon him, and for a long time the contemplation and the praying proceeded with himself alone. For months he spoke of the matter to none but God. This idea was that of another orphan house, and one of sufficient capacity to accommodate seven hundred orphans, thus actually completing a round thousand! Such a project was too vast and weighty to be hastily talked of even to his wife. To most people it would appear preposterous. The outlay would require to be not less than \$175,000, while not one dollar was in hand for such a purpose, and on Müller's principle of procedure not a dollar must be solicited from any human source. God alone was to be sought unto for the entire means for executing this stupendous work.

And, in brief, the praying, as we have seen, commenced—

commenced, and for a long time proceeded, with this one man only. But faith increased as prayer continued, and at the end of fifteen weeks of daily praying he records that during the last ten of those weeks all doubts touching the project were gone. "The greatness of the sum required," said he, "affords me a kind of secret joy; for the greater the difficulties to be overcome, the more it will be seen, to the glory of God, how much can be done by prayer and faith." The reader will here keep in mind that there were to be daily supplies of food, and instruction for three hundred persons. "Looking at it naturally," he very properly remarks, "it is enough to make one tremble. But trusting in the living God, as by his grace I was enabled to do, I had not the least trial of mind, and was assured that God would as certainly help me as when, fourteen years before, the number of orphans was only one tenth part as large."

And so with all his present responsibilities, and with no help, except from God, to meet them day by day, it was now fully in this man's mind to treble that responsibility—to increase his congregation of orphans from three hundred to one thousand, and in due time to behold before his eyes the requisite accommodations for such an unprecedented rallying. With the three hundred, the daily expenses were not less than \$50 for the orphans alone, while another \$50 would no more than cover the other expenses for each day. What would be the daily liabilities, then, when the thousand should be assembled, were easy to estimate.

The first donation for the new enterprise was half a sovereign, (about \$2 50.) On the evening of the day after the plan became publicly known a lady presented a sovereign. Three days afterward came in ten shillings, a sovereign, four half crowns, three shillings, and two shillings and sixpence. In twenty-four days only about as many pounds had been given. "But I am not discouraged," said this brave believer. "The less there comes in the more earnestly I pray, the more I look out for answers, and the more assured I am that the Lord, in his own time, after he has tried my faith, will send me larger sums, and, at last, all I need." Small amounts continue to come in, but, in a month or two, he is incited to pray specially for larger sums; when presently comes in a gift of \$2,500 for

the new building. "I was not the least excited," he writes. "*Even that very moment* when I received this donation I was looking out for means, for large donations, and I should not have been surprised if £5,000 had come in, or more." At the end of three months and a half from the day of receiving the first donation £883 had been given for the contemplated edifice, when the journal of Mr. M. reads as follows: "I am not disappointed, though as yet only the fortieth part of what is needed has come in. But how soon, how very soon, can the Lord alter the aspect of things! Even this evening while I am writing he could give me many thousand pounds." One day, a few months after this, came a present of a thousand pounds, whereby Mr. M. is, of course, greatly refreshed. Nine months afterward, during which small sums were of almost daily occurrence, a pledge was received of £8,100—the joint donation of several Christians. "The largeness of the donation," said he, "while it exceedingly refreshed my spirit, did not in the least surprise me, for I expect great things from God." "Is it not obvious," he adds, "that the principles on which I labor are not only applicable to the work of God on a small scale, but also *for the most extensive operations for God?*"

As the spring of 1856 arrived the New Orphan House Fund amounted to £29,298, and another year increased the amount to £31,817. Thus the addition of £3,000 more would carry up the building fund to the requisite figure for the erection and furnishing of the Orphan House. But the entire amount was forthcoming. Under date of February, 1858, is the entry following: "As far as I am able to judge, I have all I require in the way of pecuniary means for the third house also, so that I am able to accomplish the full enlargement of the orphan work to one thousand orphans."

The "third house" here referred to is explained by the fact that Mr. Müller had concluded to erect *two* houses instead of one, which should respectively accommodate 400 and 300 inmates. The first was already built, furnished, and opened; and the first active steps were taken for the erection of the second. Meanwhile the plan of an erection for 300 was so modified as to provide a building that should accommodate 450 instead. Considerably more expense would thus, of course, be incurred, and hence, at the end of two months after the de-

cision for the larger accommodations, £7,000 were donated and left entirely at the disposal of Mr. M., "as the work of God might more especially require it," and up to May, 1860, instead of £35,000, the sum he had at first deemed requisite for the great enlargement of his operations, £45,113 had been received—more than \$50,000 beyond the estimated cost of accommodations for the 700 additional orphans! Well might this believer in God adopt the apostolic doxology, and exclaim, "Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think—unto Him be glory!"

So the third house was begun, and the walls thereof were ascending as the book we are noticing was issued, (1860.) Of these houses a visitor and eye-witness* writes as follows: "These are all built of stone, in the most complete and thorough manner. No pains have been spared in rendering them convenient, comfortable, and safe for children, and with special reference to warmth, light, ventilation, and cleanliness; and while all is in good taste, and exceedingly chaste and neat, it is all plain—nothing for show or ornament."

The entire cost, and the manner of obtaining the funds, he quotes from Mr. M., as follows: "Without any one having been personally applied to for any thing by me, the sum of £133,528 14 (\$667,640) has been given to me for the orphans, as the result of prayer to God, since the commencement of the work, which sum includes the amount received for the building fund, for the houses already built, and the one now in progress."

Dr. Wayland presents, as follows, the summary of the orphan department of Mr. Müller's remarkable operations and efforts:

By degrees the establishment increased, and it was necessary to leave the hired houses in which the children had thus far been accommodated. Land was purchased, and a building was erected in the vicinity of Bristol. This was soon filled to overflowing, and another building was demanded. This was erected, and it was also very soon filled. These buildings were sufficient to accommodate seven hundred orphans. At the present moment (December, 1860) a third building, larger than either, is in the process of erection, and is to be finished in the course of the ensuing summer. When this shall be completed, accommodations will have been provided for eleven hundred and fifty orphans. These expensive buildings

* Rev. Dr. Sawtelle.

have been erected; the land has been purchased on which they stand; this multitude of children has been clothed, and fed, and educated; support and remuneration have been provided for all the necessary teachers and assistants, and all this has been done by a man who is not worth a dollar. He has never asked any one but God for whatever they needed, and from the beginning they have never wanted a meal, nor have they ever allowed themselves to be in debt. There seems in this to be something as remarkable as if Mr. Müller had commanded a sycamore tree to be removed and planted in the sea, and it had obeyed him.

Yet all this is but a part; for hand in hand with the great work thus portrayed, Mr. Müller, in connection with his associate and fellow-laborer, Mr. Craik, besides their personal ministry from Sabbath to Sabbath, and the care of a large Church, has, upon the same principles as in the orphan enterprise, carried forward an increasingly efficient Bible, tract, and missionary work. And here Rev. Dr. Sawtelle, the visitor and eye-witness above alluded to, shall sum up for us:

During the past year, (1860,) and out of the same funds sent in answer to prayer, there have been expended for the circulation of the Holy Scriptures the sum of £5,681 13s. 3½d.; also more than £5,000, or \$25,000, to aid missionary efforts in various parts of the world; and the total amount received since 1834, to aid the blessed work of missions in home and foreign fields, is £34,495 3s. 4d. Added to all this is the sum of £8,064 12s. 6½d. expended since 1840 for the circulation of religious books and tracts, by which sum 11,493,174 books and tracts have been circulated. Thus we see that for these various objects, disconnected with the orphans, there has been donated since March, 1834, the sum of £51,777 14s. 11d., which, added to the sum for the orphans, makes a total of £185,306 8s. 11d., nearly one million of dollars, sent to Mr. Müller from various parts of the Christian world, and from thousands who never saw him, all in answer to prayer, to aid him in carrying forward his benevolent work in saving souls, and to honor and glorify God.

With this imperfect glance at the book before us, and at the wonderful work whose process and accomplishment it reveals, we conclude our remarks with two simple and natural inquiries.

The obvious lesson from this book, and from what it narrates, is that of earnest and heartfelt prayer to God in reference to every concern of life both great and small; and our first in-

quiry is, whether this lesson be in accordance with the teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

That the doctrine of prayer itself is of the Scriptures it would be idle to argue for a moment. "I will that men pray," is unquestioned throughout the great world of Christendom. This being so, it seems equally certain that the prayers of men should comprise every lawful matter in which they are interested. Within this limit there can be no exception. The distinction of things and events into *great* and *little* is entirely common among men, and the "*little*" matters with which we are always conversant are too often passed over as either unnecessary, or unsuitable to be comprised among the subjects of prayer. All this assumes that we are capable of comprehending fully these apparent trifles, and of tracing all their bearings, and pondering all their results, however near or remote, and however slender or momentous. In other words, it assumes that we always see clearly what, among things and events, are great, and what are small, and of small consequence. It is quite unnecessary to say that this assumption involves an error most vital and important, and that human judgments of multitudes of matters in respect to their importance, absolute or relative, have proved essential, and often disastrous failures. Indeed, it is not at all unlikely that the distinctions of things into great and little, important and unimportant, eventful and uneventful, is merely human, and has little or no place in the divine mind; and it may very possibly be that with Him who made the world and all things that are therein, whose great Providence superintends all, and who, in respect to every thing, sees the end from the beginning—it may be possible, we say, that with Him there is nothing small, nothing unimportant or uneventful. Certain it is of ourselves that, in regard to every thing, we "see as through a glass darkly," and the keenest, clearest, largest human vision is essentially limited—so limited, indeed, that there is not a solitary matter or event, current or historical, ever so conspicuous or insignificant, and relating to ourselves or any other parties that are or ever were on this earth, upon which we may place our finger and say, *This I completely comprehend.* Ever are we moving amid multitudinous influences, a few of them proceeding from sources which we see and partially appreciate, and thousands of others where-

of we are unaware, and take no account, while yet their tendency may be more or less directly toward our weal or woe. The Scriptures recognize this fact, as well in their teachings touching prayer as outside of such teachings. Hence the direction to man is, "In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and he shall direct thy paths." "Be careful for nothing; but in every thing, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, make your requests known unto God."

And what do such Scriptures assume but that in every way of ours, nay, every step we take, literally or otherwise, we are incompetent to go alone; and that in all things pertaining to us, and our relations to others, we need the Divine help; and, needing this, we should ask for it with prayer and supplication?

The narrative further teaches that while prayer should be thus comprehensive, it should be *trustful* as well. In other words the prayer, in all its lawful requests, should be accompanied with a confident expectation of being answered. This was clearly the spirit and character of the constant prayer offered by Mr. Müller, which certainly bears the seeming of having been answered in a manner which we are accustomed to term wonderful. Were those trustful prayers scriptural, or was it a species of fanaticism to pray as he did for such things as he asked for, and especially with such expectations as he indulged in connection with his prayers?

Much is said in the New Testament of *faith* as accompanying prayer to God; and so various are the references to this matter, especially in the personal teachings of Christ himself, that we deem it quite unnecessary to repeat them. A single striking instance will be sufficient for our purpose; and it is recorded in Mark xi, 22-24, reading as follows:

And Jesus answering saith unto them, Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith. Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them.

Laying this remarkable Scripture along-side of the curious picture presented in Mr. Müller's narrative, and what is the discrepancy between the two? What are the marvelous details

of that history, from beginning to end, but a sort of running and perpetual commentary upon the scriptural declaration? This man asked of God. He asked for all lawful things; but he, as suggested by Dr. Wayland, asked as for the "removal of mountains," yet he asked *expecting to receive*.

And why did he indulge this expectation? Why this trust? What was its right or propriety? We answer that this confident expectation was founded upon what had been divinely promised, and it was, therefore, perfectly reasonable, and without a particle of fanaticism. The man simply believed God—the most rational thing under the sun. He who would cavil at the *trust* exercised by Mr. Müller when asking great and good things of the Lord should begin his cavils with God himself, and with his promise. He should first attack the great pledge that "*Every one that asketh, receiveth.*" The trusting of this pledge was the head and front of this man's offending. Go behind him, therefore, ye who demur, and hold your controversy with God that promised. The unreasonableness of the prayer of faith, and the whole of it, is that of *trusting Him who cannot lie*.

But how can one "believe that he receives?" receives while he sees nothing, feels nothing, and all is vacancy? Ask some little boy whose father, kind, excellent, and true, is sitting before him, and whom the child never thought of distrusting. Says this father to his boy, "My son, I have some delicious apples somewhere near by; ask for one and you shall have it." "Please, pa, give me one;" says the child; and as he thus asks, not a shadow of a doubt crosses his little soul that the apple is forthcoming. His father has the apples, and he has promised one for the asking, and he is true. The confidence or trust of the little boy is as if he were receiving the apple simultaneously with the asking for it. But from human imperfection the asking and receiving are not precisely identical in time. Here the latter must follow the former; and so it often is in the Divine giving, but not necessary or always so. The asking and receiving are often in the same moment. Amid the very moments of Daniel's supplication the Angel of Blessing was descending to him, "being caused to fly swiftly." Quicker than the lightning's flash can He answer the requests that are "made known" to him. The laws of time and succession

bind not that arm, nor limit at all the Infinite goodness. A day, a moment, is with Him as a thousand years. "Believe that ye receive," then, implies no error or fanaticism in him who is asking of God. Nay, not only is this asking and receiving often simultaneous, but the receiving sometimes anticipates the asking; for "Before they call I will answer," is one of the wondrous presentations of outbursting, overflowing mercy. Its grand proclamation is, "Believe that ye receive!" receive while you are asking, receive as you are, receive *now!*

But suppose the answer to the trustful prayer is delayed, as it often seems to be; then the doctrine of the Narrative, as well as of the Scriptures, is that the same prayer and trust be persisted in to the last—that it be urged day by day—that the delay of the response is doubtless for the best of reasons, and that the blessing thus sought, and sought earnestly and perseveringly, is sure to be received. So says, also, the Scripture teaching. The importunity of the man who had "nothing to set before" his friend is an illustration. So, also, the poor widow's long persistence with the unjust judge, "And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him though he bear long with them; I tell you that he will avenge them speedily."

We conclude, therefore, that the career of Mr. Müller—especially in his constant and trustful prayer to God—was as fully in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures as its success was remarkable and astonishing.

Our second inquiry is, Whether the Christian community generally have attained to this life of prayer and trust?

We approach this inquiry with sincere reluctance, inasmuch as we fear that it must be answered in the negative. The simple, earnest, persistent, trustful prayer which in this article we have been contemplating is, as we think, certainly wanting with multitudes of professing Christians of every denomination, and with too many ministers of the Gospel. One man, George Müller, of Bristol, England, as he began his ministry, addressed himself to a life of trust in God—a trust as absolute as possible—in reference to every interest, great and small, with which he was connected; and the spectacle is before the world of what, with this man, a quarter of a century has brought forth. And what a work for one third of a life-time! What if ten thousand

of the Christian ministers had in the same time set themselves to the exercise of that same unfailing trust and that same prevailing prayer? What if a hundred thousand of the Christian laity had, in these last twenty-five years, thus dedicated themselves? No one can doubt that the result would have been immeasurably great and important. Of course, this result would not have generally taken the shape of orphan houses and orphan schools; but that a vast work of heavenly charity in many a beautiful form would have been the issue is as certain as revelation. Mournful is it to meditate that many a Christian, and, it is to be feared, many a Christian minister, stands to this day, in doubt in respect to the prayer of faith and its authority, propriety, and efficiency. The writer remembers with pain that when, at a union meeting some years since in Boston, this prayer and trust were illustrated very nearly as in these pages, an eminent minister of that city arose in his place and remarked, "I cannot believe, yet will not here dispute, the views just presented." But why not believe what God has promised? As to interpretation, is there any room for doubt about his meaning when he asserts that, "Every one that asketh, receiveth?" True, all this is wonderful in the extreme. It is beyond measure astonishing that such a prerogative is deposited with man. It must be granted that it is much as if the doors of the heavenly world were thrown wide open to a man, and he bidden to go in and possess it. True, heaven here comes down to earth. True, this goes far to explain how that "All things are yours." Were a father having immense possessions to say to his son, "Ask what you will, and you shall be gratified," we should pronounce such a son to be rich indeed.

And is not directly here one of the secrets of the difficulty? Is not the very immensity of good proffered by the "exceeding great and precious promises" that which causes us to stagger? "It is too much, too much for belief!" and so multitudes stagger on, and never, in all their lives long reach and grasp the faith that is commensurate with the divine proffers; and so distrust instead of trust characterizes their Christian experience and career, and from year to year till they die they miss, to a painful extent, the faith without which it is impossible to please God. "Open your mouth wide and I will fill it!" is

the proclamation. But the mouth remains closed, or opens but slightly, and the fullness remains unknown.

Listen to a thousand prayers, (alas for the seeming necessity of writing this!) listen to the current prayers of a multitude of Christian men—the prayers of the family, of the prayer-meeting, of the pulpit. Ponder those words, those formulas, those commonplaces, those circumlocutions, those often prolonged exercises, those wordy addresses and frigid formalities. Ah! where is *faith*? This would discern the great presence-chamber, and Christ in the midst, and heaven very near, and a world of good accessible and near enough to be touched and appropriated, and the infinite price that purchased it. This would banish all stupor, carelessness, irreverence, spiritual pride, and every vain thought. This would bring the man near to God, and purify his spirit, and chasten his words, and simplify his speech, and lay him infinitely low at the feet of mercy, and would grasp the great and desired blessing.

Faith—Trust! Is not this the grand desideratum all amid the “great and goodly fellowship?” Seizing upon this, and cherishing this, and holding fast forever to this, would not the Christians of the earth go on conquering and to conquer—having in veritable and joyous possession “the victory that overcometh the world?”*

* Our impression is that all this needs its limitations to guard it from fanaticism. Mr. Müller's history seems to us to indicate that his power of faith was a *gift*, a *charism*; such as doubtless abounded in the Pentecostal Church, and will abound more and more as the Church again rises to her true Pentecostal and millennial level. And as the gift is bestowed, so it is limited, by the wisdom of the Divine Giver. Even the power of Müller's faith seems limited to certain definite objects. The political rule of the world, the banishment of war, the establishment of perfect law and perfect freedom over and among mankind, are not *yet* subordinated to the prayer of faith; or, rather, the faith that can subordinate them is not *yet* given. But we thank God for giving us even an occasional George Müller to furnish the spy-glass through which we catch a vista, showing us the route by which the latter-day glory may be attained.—ED.

**ART. VII.—DOCTRINAL PHASES OF UNIVERSALISM
DURING THE PAST CENTURY.**

OUR Universalist friends of late have said some very caustic things about the changes of Orthodoxy* during the last century. This has led to the reply that Universalism has changed, which they have been unwilling to admit.

An examination of this question may not be unprofitable, but may lead to good results, as a contribution to the history of dogmatic thought. As we do so, we shall see that their denominational history divides itself into three doctrinal periods, each marked by its peculiarities.

The First Period extends from the landing of Murray in the United States in 1770, to the close of his ministry in 1809—the incipient stage.

The Second Period extends from the close of Murray's labors in 1809, to 1845—the Unitarian transformation.

The Third Period extends from 1845 until the present time.

PERIOD FIRST.—*The incipient stage—From the landing of the Rev. John Murray, in 1770, until the close of his ministry in 1809.*

Prior to Mr. Murray's arrival in this country, during the middle of the last century, a few original thinkers had appeared in different localities, who had broken away from the current Calvinistic theology, and had asserted the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men. The most of these were Restorationists, who had probably become such largely through the works of Stonehouse and Seigvolk; but the transition was a natural one, for in most minds Universalism was originally a logical deduction from high Calvinism.

In 1741 there appeared in Germantown, Pennsylvania, Dr. George De Benneville, a refugee from persecution in Europe, who soon became very extensively and favorably known as a skillful physician and a lay preacher, who occasionally, for many years, made extensive tours through Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, preaching the doctrine of the final restoration of all men to holiness and happiness.

* Embracing all denominations who hold to endless punishment.

In 1753 an edition of Paul Seigvolk's "Everlasting Gospel" was published in Germantown, in which the doctrine of Restoration was inculcated. In this place there was a society of German Baptists, descendants from the Anabaptists of Germany, from whom they seem to have inherited these peculiar sentiments.

Rev. Philip Clarke, Rector of St. Philip's Church, Charleston, South Carolina, was a believer in universal salvation. He preached in that city from 1754 to 1759.

Rev. Jonathan Mayhew, D. D., Pastor of the West Church, Boston, from 1747 to 1766, believed and preached the universal restitution of all things.

Rev. Charles Chauncey, D. D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church, in Boston, for nearly sixty years, seems also to have held the same view. He adopted this doctrine as early as 1757, and soon after wrote a book entitled "The Mystery Hid from Ages; or, the Salvation of All Men." But he was very cautious in expressing these opinions, and the volume was not published until 1784, only three years before his death, at the age of eighty-two years.

Three other preachers appeared before the American public about the time that Mr. Murray did, or very soon after: Revs. Adam Streeter, Caleb Rich, and Thomas Barnes. Mr. Streeter was an ordained minister of the Baptist denomination, and, on becoming a Universalist, he preached his new opinions very freely in various parts of New England, and died in Smithfield, Rhode Island, September 22, 1786. Mr. Rich joined the Baptist Church in Warwick, New Hampshire, in 1771, but soon became a Universalist, and preached those doctrines for many years. Mr. Barnes was an early convert of Mr. Rich, and subsequently became the founder of Universalism in Maine. These three preachers when they adopted the principles of Universalism had never heard of Mr. Murray.

Such were some of the first outcroppings of a revulsion from Calvinism, which was soon to become general. And as we progress we shall notice that all the first preachers of Universalism were originally Calvinistic, either by profession or by early associations. Mr. Murray himself was a *Calvinistic* Methodist, of the school of Whitefield and Lady Huntingdon. Winchester was a Baptist, and so were Streeter and Rich. In the subse-

quent periods we shall see that Hosea Ballou, and his nephew Hosea Ballou, 2d, D. D., Adin Ballou, Walter Balfour, Sylvanus Cobb, D. D., and many others, were Baptists, and had been reared under strong Calvinistic influences.

But two men stand more conspicuous than any others as the founders of Universalism in this country, and are referred to by the Universalists themselves as the patriarchs and pioneers of the denomination—Revs. John Murray and Elhanan Winchester.

Of these Mr. Murray occupies the most prominent position, having been styled THE FATHER OF UNIVERSALISM IN THE UNITED STATES because of the extent and publicity of his labors, his success in awakening public attention to his doctrines, and in founding societies of that faith. He was originally a Whitefieldian Methodist, and was converted to Universalism by Rev. James Relley of London. He was a very spiritual and devout man, and was thoroughly evangelical in his views, except at one point, the final holiness and happiness of all men. He retained high views of Divine sovereignty through life. He held to the doctrine of the trinity, substitutional atonement, the peculiar saving efficacy of divine grace through faith in Christ, regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Ghost, a personal devil, the resurrection of the literal body, the future general judgment resulting in the salvation of all men, and a literal hell, in which devils would be punished forever.

Mr. Murray entertained very high views upon the question, What constitutes a Universalist? With him the experience of salvation meant a radical change in men's hearts, and saving faith was a deep spiritual exercise of the soul, bringing men into conscious union and harmony with God. Speaking of some, "who," he says, "are not heart believers, but only head believers," and "who contend that because Jesus is the Saviour of all men therefore they shall be saved," he says,

I am more and more convinced that nothing but the spirit and power of God can make a consistent Universalist. Do you ask me what it is that constitutes a consistent Universalist? I answer, A consistent Universalist must be taught of God and under the influence of the Divine Spirit,* etc.

* Hints Relative to the Forming of a Christian Church. A Pamphlet. By Rev John Murray. Boston, 1791. Page 45.

Much more of this kind might be added had we space.

Murray's theology recognized no way of salvation but personal saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, upon which he continually insisted, as will be seen in the following extract. Speaking of those who "suppose that all will be on a level in the article of death," he says,

Neither in life or death, in the body or out of the body, can any of the ransomed of the Lord be saved from misery till they are made acquainted with God as their Saviour; and though in death the spirit does not go with the body into the dust, and must be under the eye of the Father of Spirits, yet "where Christ is," that is, in "fullness of joy," they never can be till they have peace and joy in believing; no, he who dies in unbelief lies down in sorrow and will rise in the resurrection of damnation, or, more properly, condemnation.*

It is very important that we should obtain a clear view of Mr. Murray's doctrine of the judgment.† He regarded the Bible as teaching the judgment as *past and present*, and also *yet to come*. "The *past judgment*" was "by Christ, when on earth." "Now is the judgment of this world." "The *present judgment*" is that in which "every one taught of God judges himself." "Judge yourselves, and ye shall not be judged." "The judgment *yet to come*" is that of "the last great day," in which all who have not judged themselves, all unbelievers of the human race, and all fallen angels through whose influence the unbelieving part of mankind are held in darkness and blindness, shall be judged by the Saviour of the world, but these two characters shall then be separated—one placed on the right hand and the other on the left—the one, the "sheep," for whose salvation he laid down his life; the other, "accursed," whose nature he passed by. In that future judgment believers who have judged themselves shall not be judged, nor will they be present.

REV. ELHANAN WINCHESTER,

Pastor of a Baptist Church in Philadelphia, avowed himself a Restorationist in 1781. He was converted to these views by reading the works of Seigvolk and Stonehouse. Like Mr. Murray he was a deeply devoted and zealous man, of respect-

* Hints Relative to the Forming of a Christian Church.

† Murray's Hints, pp. 9, 10, 33.

able literary qualifications, and their theological views seem not to have differed, except in regard to the punishment of the wicked after a future general judgment, which Mr. Winchester taught would then take place, resulting in the holiness and happiness of all men. But Mr. Murray denied that there would be any misery after the general judgment.

Mr. Winchester was very definite and positive in his views of future retribution, holding to a literal hell, a literal fire and brimstone, whose torment will be strictly penal, which he proclaimed in the most terrific strains, and the duration of which he taught would be forty-two thousand years, being equal in all cases. This period he seems to have deduced from a fanciful interpretation of certain prophetic types and numbers. He died in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1797, at the early age of forty-six years, leaving behind him more than forty volumes and pamphlets, but few of which now exist except in rare libraries. He had been very zealous and extensive in his labors, preaching seven years in England, where he made many converts to his views, as well as in this country.

These early Universalists seem not to have identified themselves in any

UNITED MOVEMENTS

except on a very few occasions. Dr. Chauncey never met with Murray and Winchester, and Winchester moved in an orbit entirely his own, except on two occasions. Once he occupied Murray's pulpit in Boston, and he was present with Murray at the first General Convention of Universalists, in Oxford, Massachusetts, in 1785, where he preached a sermon, of which Murray speaks favorably in his *Autobiography*. This convention was a small body, made up of only three ministers, and delegates from the Societies at Gloucester, Boston, Milford, and Oxford. The third minister was Rev. Caleb Rich. We have no evidence of any united action of Mr. Winchester with Mr. Murray at any other time.

MURRAY *versus* WINCHESTER.

The differences between these two men, although not numerous, were very decided; Murray being absolutely and uncompromisingly opposed to the doctrine of the punishment of sinners,

even for a limited period, in the future world, and Winchester preaching and writing upon it in the most flaming and alarming strains.

But precisely at this point a controversy has arisen between Universalists of a later period. We occasionally find it stated in the Universalist literature of the last forty years that Murray was a Restorationist. It was not an uncommon thing to meet this assertion from 1823 to 1838 in the writings of Revs. Adin Ballou, Paul Dean, and others, who were the leaders in a split in the denomination, in favor of Restorationism, which then occurred.

In their circular, sent out at that time, they say that "there has been of late years a great departure from the sentiments of the first Universalist preachers in this country," and that they "believe with Murray, Winchester, Chauncey, and the ancient authors who have written upon this subject, in future rewards and punishments, to be followed by the final restoration of all mankind to holiness and happiness."

But these assertions were ably and unanswerably refuted by Rev. Thomas Whittemore,* then editor of the "Trumpet," by abundant quotations from Mr. Murray's writings, explicitly declaring his dissent from Mr. Winchester's doctrine of restorationism.

And yet in "The Universalist," February 11, 1871, Rev. Adin Ballou re-asserts the same thing, declaring that the Universalist denomination "was originally Restorationist in faith, and so remained, in doctrinal exposition, till after the year 1815." "The doctrine of universal salvation, without any disciplinary punishment after death, was advocated by certain persons in England and America before and after the Universalist Convention in 1785, but was strongly denounced by Winchester and Murray, the leading founders of that Convention." "Hosea Ballou was the first preacher (at least of any note) inside the Universalist denomination who advocated universal salvation without any disciplinary punishment after death, some time between 1815 and 1820." Such are Rev. Adin Ballou's present assertions, notwithstanding the demonstrations of Mr. Whittemore to the contrary, from thirty to forty years ago, over and over again in the "Trumpet."

* See "Trumpet" of that period.

Now what are the facts in the case? If we have correctly apprehended the views of these men the disagreement has grown out of a want of discrimination at one point, which will soon be brought out. But it is due that Mr. Winchester should first be permitted to state his views of the punishment of the wicked in his own words. He says:

Some suppose that all punishment and pain shall end at the coming of Christ, and mankind at once shall be restored; but destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity, and to those who refuse to submit to the Lord; and as for punishment ceasing when he first comes, it is a mistake of great magnitude, for the punishment of the wicked will continue ages of ages after the day of judgment.*

Again he says, "They can never be loosed from it until they are wholly subdued."†

We are now ready to proceed with the solution of this question. In the first place, what does Mr. Murray himself say in regard to the doctrine of restoration? To a friend he said:

Mr. Winchester considers weak, ruined individuals as paying their own debts; yea, to the uttermost farthing. I see no strength but in Christ Jesus; be you assured, therefore, I am not of Mr. Winchester's school.‡

Again he says:

A second class of Universalists insist on purgatorial satisfaction, according to which every man must come to be his own savior; for if I must suffer as much in my own person as will satisfy Divine justice, how is or how can Jesus Christ be my savior? If this purgatorial doctrine be true, the ministry of reconciliation committed to the apostles must be false; to wit, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses." In fact, I know no description of people further from Christianity, true Christianity, than such Universalists. . . . As I descend into the vale of life these discoveries give me a touch of sorrow, and I anticipate a harvest of evil.§

In these extracts, more of which might be given, we see Mr. Murray explicitly declaring that he is "not of Mr. Winchester's school," and joining direct issue with Restorationists.

Whence then has arisen the discrepancy in the views of these leading Universalists as to Mr. Murray's opinions? It has been

* Winchester on the Prophecies, vol. i, p. 265.

† Ibid., p. 278.

‡ Murray's Letters, vol. ii, p. 263.

§ Ibid., vol. ii, p. 130.

from this point. Mr. Murray did nevertheless believe that those who die in sin and unbelief will suffer after death until the judgment day. Hence Mr. Whittemore ("Trumpet," July 8, 1837) says, "Universalists have always allowed that Mr. Murray believed in future misery, but he did not believe it in any such sense as the Restorationists now do."

Mr. Murray believed that all men had broken the law of God, and were all therefore justly exposed to its penalties. But these penalties had been fully suffered by Christ for us on the cross. His punishment on the cross was our punishment for sin. Hence, strictly speaking, Mr. Murray did not hold to punishment for sin either in this life or in the next, for Christ had suffered all the punishment due to sin. But every man must be saved by faith, by a personal acceptance of Christ. Hence the miseries attendant upon unbelief will continue as long as unbelief shall continue, whether in this world or the next; but they are unavoidable consequences, and not penalties. It is these unavoidable consequences of sin and unbelief, and not punishment for them, which will extend into the future world, because sin and unbelief will exist there. Mr. Winchester held to a day of judgment after death, at which men would be sentenced to punishment; but the judgment in which Mr. Murray believed was designed to deliver men from all sin and all unbelief, by revealing to them the character of God, showing the things that belong to their peace, and making them acquainted with salvation. In that day all knees should bow and accept Christ, and enter into eternal rest.* In Mr. Murray's opinion, the sheep were mankind and the goats were the devils; and in the day of judgment mankind should be separated from the body of sin and death, and gathered on the right hand.† In the light of these facts, it is beyond dispute that Mr. Murray, the chief founder of Universalism, was not a Restorationist.

The early conventions of 1785 and 1803, and of the intervening period also, embraced men of the two schools, Murray's and Winchester's, who agreed as to the final happiness of all men; and in the platform which was adopted in 1803 the differences were ignored, as may be seen in the second Article:

* See "Trumpet," August 11, 1832. Also, Murray's "Hints," Boston, 1791.

† See Murray's Life, third edition, pp. 323, 324.

We believe in one God, whose nature is Love, revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ by one Holy Spirit of grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

Such was the condition of things during the first period of Universalism. 1. It was a departure from the generally accepted evangelical theology chiefly at one point—the final salvation of all men. It was in the hands of deeply religious men, and it had no taint of Unitarianism or of Rationalism. 2. Murray held to the salvation of all men at the general judgment, and that unbelievers would be in a state of misery until that time; not penal, but the natural consequence of sin and unbelief, Christ having endured the penalty for them. 3. Winchester held to a local hell, and a long period of disciplinary punishment after the general judgment, resulting in the final salvation of all men. In what proportion these different opinions then prevailed in the denomination we have no means of judging.

PERIOD SECOND.—*The Unitarian transformation—From the close of Mr. Murray's labors in 1809, to 1845, under Rev. Hosea Ballou.*

We have shown what Universalism was in its incipient stage under Murray and Winchester. The leading spirits of the second period were Revs. Hosea Ballou, Walter Balfour, and Thomas Whittemore, D. D. Rev. Sebastian Streeter should also be introduced, being many years a very popular Universalist preacher in Boston; and, during the latter part of this period, Revs. William A. Drew, Stephen R. Smith, Adolphus Skinner, T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and others, became prominent. But Messrs. Ballou, Balfour, and Whittemore evidently shaped the period.

Mr. Ballou began to preach in 1792, became pastor of a Universalist Church in Dana, Mass., in 1794, then went to Barnard, Vt., then to Portsmouth, N. H., to Salem, Mass., in 1815, and to Boston in 1817, where he remained Pastor of the School-street Church until his death, in 1852. When he came to Boston he was in his forty-second year, and had already acquired considerable influence in the denomination. He had been a diligent student and a steady thinker, and the views for which he became distinguished were already nearly matured.

Mr. Whittemore says that "he became an avowed Unitarian

as early as 1795." * He thus early rejected the doctrine of the Trinity and of a personal devil. In 1804 he published a volume of "Notes on the Parables, and, in 1811, a "Treatise on the Atonement," which was essentially Unitarian in its character. He discarded the doctrine of regeneration and the efficacy of saving grace and faith in Christ, as taught by Murray and the evangelical theologians. Boston was a central position, where Mr. Ballou became very prominent at once, and was soon felt as a master-mind, the leader and champion of the denomination.

In the dissemination of his peculiar views Mr. Ballou was soon supported by several men, who exerted an extensive influence. The one who attained to the earliest prominence was Rev. Walter Balfour. He had been reared and well educated in Scotland, and became Pastor of a Baptist Church in Charlestown, Mass. In 1823 he avowed himself a Universalist, and within a few years he published some of their ablest controversial works. He died January 3, 1853, almost five months after the decease of Mr. Ballou.

Rev. Thomas Whittemore, D. D., although a much younger man, came very soon into the front rank, and maintained it until his death, in 1861. He was born in Boston, in the year 1800. In his twentieth year he fell under Mr. Ballou's influence, with whom he studied for the ministry, and entered upon its work in Milford, Mass., in 1821. The following year he became Pastor of a Church in Cambridge, where he remained nine years. During a part of this period he was editor of the "Universalist Trumpet and Magazine," which position he held with great ability for thirty years. He early † adopted Mr. Ballou's theological opinions, and was an able and zealous expounder and advocate of them in his paper.

Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, D. D., is worthy of especial mention in this period, having exerted a very extensive influence as a preacher, an editor, and the author of a "Universalist Commentary on the New Testament." He commenced preaching among them in Maine in 1820, came to Malden, Mass., in 1828, where he was Pastor of a Church ten years. He was editor of the "Christian Freeman" from 1839 until 1862, when it was

* Life of Ballou, vol. iii, p. 87.

† See Sermon by Mr. Whittemore, preached in Cambridge, May, 1822.

united with the "Trumpet." Mr. Cobb was very prominent in the antislavery and temperance reforms.

Under the influence of these men and a few others we shall soon see Universalism molded into a new form, and taking on a new type. While retaining the leading idea of the final holiness and happiness of all men, it nevertheless underwent radical changes in its theology.

These changes were not wholly the result of individual influence, but were largely the drift of the time; a reaction from the extreme Calvinistic theology which then prevailed. But at the close of the last and the beginning of the present century the Unitarian defection was spreading. It was in the atmosphere of this period, and reached its decisive development from 1810 to 1825. It seems that the early Universalists were peculiarly susceptible to this tendency. Having broken away from Orthodoxy at one point, it was easier to make other changes. Mr. Murray seems to have noticed this tendency before he died.

In our sketch of the previous period we noticed Mr. Murray's apprehensions of changes about to take place among his followers. Mrs. Murray, in her continuation of her husband's autobiography, speaking of the Convention in 1785, says, "But, alas! in no long time a root of bitterness sprang up which destroyed his pleasure in the association." Mr. Demarest says:

The "root of bitterness" to which Mrs. Murray refers was probably the widening divergence of the views of his brethren from those of Mr. Murray. Not only did these relate to expositions, but also to fundamental doctrines. Some had already, even before Mr. Ballou's day, adopted the sentiment that the painful consequences of sin are confined to this life. Others, retaining the doctrine of the Trinity, rejected the theory of vicarious atonement, while the general tendency of thought among Universalists was in the direction of Unitarian views of the Divine nature. These various sentiments, conflicting with Mr. Murray's own cherished ideas of Gospel truth, caused him much uneasiness.*

We shall soon see his worst fears realized, and the Universalism of Murray thoroughly

REVOLUTIONIZED BY UNITARIANISM;

and, as a consequence, losing the decided religious type which Murray and Winchester had given to it.

* *Life of Murray*, 1870, p. 338.

Mr. Murray had been disabled by palsy in 1809, and died in 1815. But before his death his pulpit had been several times occupied by a rising man in the denomination, of marked and commanding abilities, bold, quick-sighted, and self-reliant, who had unhesitatingly proclaimed radical innovations in their current theology. During the next forty years he is to be the leader of the denomination ; but he wears not the mantle of Murray, and under him a new impress and impulse is to be given to this people. This man we have already introduced. Mr. Ballou may be regarded as one of the earliest promoters of the Unitarian sentiment of New England. Some other Universalist ministers had entertained similar views for some time, but they were for the most part cautious and hesitating in their avowals, until they came under the bold and inspiring leadership of Ballou. Mr. Whittemore says that "He was not shy of his Unitarian opinions. Soon after his removal to Boston he assailed the doctrine of the Trinity with much power. He published clear and correct articles on the subject of the atonement, and on the general character of rational and liberal Christianity. The Unitarians were fearful they should be considered Universalists,"* and the younger Ware came out with a disclaimer, in letters to Dr. M'Leod, of New York. The transition to Unitarianism was rapid, and soon became complete on most of the leading tenets. Rev. Paul Dean, of Boston, preached before the General Convention of Universalists in 1825, and in his discourse he distinctly avowed Trinitarian opinions. Mr. Whittemore says, "This, we believe, was the *last* time the doctrine of the Trinity was ever preached before the Convention."† Again Mr. Whittemore says :

From the early years of Mr. Ballou's ministry to the day of his death he was a firm, consistent, faithful defender of the strict unity of God, and of the sonship and subordination of Christ to the Father. Never did he waver in this matter. On every proper occasion, in public and in private, he declared, without any reserve, his Unitarian views.‡

In 1834 he published an extended article against the doctrine of the Trinity, and in his life-time the whole denomination became anti-Trinitarians, discarding the doctrines of a personal

* Life of Ballou, vol. ii, p. 90.

† Life of Ballou, vol. ii, p. 304.

‡ Ibid., vol. iii, p. 170.

devil, a substitutional atonement, depravity, the special efficacy of Divine grace, regeneration, etc., as held by Murray. But there were also

OTHER RADICAL CHANGES,

touching the doctrine of a future judgment and misery after death. We have seen that Murray and Winchester both believed in a future general judgment. Murray believed that the wicked would suffer the natural consequences of sin and unbelief in the period between death and the judgment and then be saved, and Winchester teaching that they would be punished for a long period after the day of judgment and then gathered into heaven. But Mr. Ballou rejected the doctrine of a future general judgment, contending that it takes place in the present life,* and that all punishment for sin is in this life. Originally he was a Restorationist. The history of the change in his mind we will give in his own words, in a letter which appears in Whittemore's History of Modern Universalism :

When I wrote my Notes on the Parables, (1804,) and my Treatise on the Atonement, (1811,) I had traveled in my mind away from penal sufferings so entirely that I was satisfied that if any suffered in the future state it would be because they would be sinful in that state. But I cannot say that I was fully satisfied that the Bible taught no punishment in the future world until I obtained this satisfaction by attending to the subject with Brother Edward Turner, of Charlestown. For the purpose of satisfying ourselves concerning the doctrine of the Scriptures on this question we agreed to do the best we could, he in favor of future punishment, (Restorationism,) and I the contrary. Our investigations were published in a periodical called the "Gospel Visitant." While attending to this correspondence, I became entirely satisfied that the Scriptures begin and end the history of sin in flesh and blood, and that beyond this mortal existence the Bible teaches no other sentient state but that which is called by the blessed names of life and immortality.

This discussion occurred in the years 1817 and 1818.† From this time Mr. Ballou was fully committed to the doctrine of no punishment after death, boldly avowing it in a controversy with Rev. Timothy Merritt in 1818, in his pulpit discourses, and in his writings for the press. He was soon

* See Ballou's Controversy with Rev. Timothy Merritt in 1818.

† Life of Ballou, vol. ii, pp. 28, 29.

recognized as the champion of this doctrine. It was not altogether new, but it had been only timidly uttered before, or presented as a speculation, or started as a query. It had certainly never before been so vigorously presented and insisted upon. In Mr. Ballou's hands it meant something; it was a cardinal doctrine.

It is not surprising, therefore, that there should have been some commotion in some quarters, and even opposition; for the doctrine of Restorationism in some form seems to have been held by many, and probably by the majority, of Universalists of that period. Hence from 1821 to 1823 we find a large number of articles on this subject in the "Universalist Magazine," called forth in opposition to the doctrine of Mr. Ballou and in defense of Restorationism, such as the articles signed "E. A. R."* "Stater,"† "Christian Universalist,"‡ "Justitia,"§ and "Restorationist."|| These articles are understood to have been written by prominent men in the denomination, Revs. Edward Turner, of Charlestown, Paul Dean, of Boston, Jacob Wood, then of Stirling, and Dr. John Brooks, of Bernardston, Mass. A book was also published in defense of Restorationism with the assumed title "Philo Bereanus." Some of these writers argued very strongly that the doctrine of Mr. Ballou was immoral in its tendency, and insisted that a belief in Restorationism ought to be a test of Christian fellowship ¶ in the Universalist denomination. The conflict became very spirited, enlisting a great amount of feeling, especially among the Restorationists, who looked with jealousy upon the growing influence of Mr. Ballou, and his doctrine of no punishment after death. But so dexterous and effective, and withal so conciliatory, was Mr. Ballou in every defense of his views, that he seemed to come out of every contest with a stronger hold upon the denomination. The opposing wing continued to agitate and struggle, and finally conspired;** and twice during a period of less than nine years their efforts culminated in attempts to produce

* Vol. iii, p. 1.

† Ibid., pp. 6, 7.

‡ Ibid., pp. 113, 123, 131.

§ Ibid., pp. 127, 132, etc.

|| Ibid., pp. 150, 151.

¶ Life of Ballou by Whittemore, vol. ii, p. 165, and "Universalist Magazine," p. 162, Ballou's reply to "Philo Bereanus."

** See Life of Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, D. D., p. 107.

A SCHISM IN THE UNIVERSALIST BODY.

The first attempt to effect a division in the denomination occurred in 1823, when "An Appeal and Declaration" was published, setting forth that "the ancient doctrine of Restoration had been corrupted, that this corruption was seated and growing among the Universalists in the United States," that "the doctrine of universal salvation at the commencement of the future state" is "subversive of a just sense of accountability to God and the proper distinctions between virtue and vice, lessening the motives to virtue, and giving force to the temptations of sin."* The parties to this declaration were Revs. Jacob Wood, Paul Dean, Edward Turner, Barzillai Streeter, Charles Hudson, and Levi Briggs. A few others sympathized with them, but did not join in the movement. Mr. Ballou immediately replied to this document, and with such kindness of spirit, tact, and ability that no further movement was then made. At a meeting of an association during the following summer, Messrs. Turner, Hudson, and B. Streeter signed a paper of settlement of their differences, and remained in fellowship with the denomination. Mr. Dean at first withdrew, but soon after returned.† Not long after, however, Messrs. Wood, Briggs, Hudson, and Streeter left the Universalist ministry.‡ Mr. Dean's society subsequently became Unitarians, and Mr. Turner shortly afterward removed to Portsmouth, N. H.

Such was the result of the first attempt to divide the denomination in the interest of Restorationism. The agitation of that subject nearly ceased for several years, and the leaders lost all their influence § with the Universalist body.

But four years after the controversy was opened anew by Rev. Charles Hudson, in a duodecimo volume of nine letters, addressed to Rev. Hosea Ballou, to which Mr. Balfour replied, and Mr. Hudson rejoined, in 1829.

In 1830 a new champion of Restorationism appeared, Rev. Adin Ballou, of Mendon, Mass., who had been about seven years connected with the denomination, having been originally

* See "Universalist Magazine," January 25, 1823.

† Life of Ballou, by Whittemore, vol. ii, p. 259.

‡ Life of Ballou, by Whittemore, p. 224.

§ Ibid., vol. iii, p. 87.

a Baptist. He published an elaborate sermon * in the advocacy of Restorationism, which was reviewed by Mr. Whittemore in the "Trumpet" of July 3, 1830, in which he declared that the sermon did not represent "the views of the American Universalists," and otherwise criticised it in terms of very decided dissent. Soon after, Mr. Adin Ballou, feeling that there was no chance for his views to be represented in "The Trumpet," and, perhaps, disaffected by other unpleasant things which had occurred, started a new paper in January, 1831, called the "Independent Messenger," for the special advocacy of Restorationism and some other peculiar opinions. This was the first step in another attempt to divide the denomination in the interest of Restorationism, more successful than the former eight years before, but which, in turn, was also destined to be a failure.

In August, 1831, a convention of Universalist ministers assembled in Mendon, Mass., and organized themselves as the "Massachusetts Association of Universal Restorationists." The ministers present were Revs. Paul Dean, Charles Hudson, Adin Ballou, Lyman Maynard, Nathaniel Wright, and Seth Chandler, of Massachusetts, Philemon R. Russell of New Hampshire, and David Pickering of Rhode Island—eight. In their preamble, they set forth that there had been "of late years a great departure from the sentiments of the first Universalist preachers in this country by a majority of the General Convention." Mr. Whittemore immediately replied in "The Trumpet," † exposing their inconsistency in accusing the main body of Universalists of departing from the opinions of the fathers "when they themselves had departed as widely as any Universalists had done." He also said, "These men do not all profess to hold with Murray and Winchester the doctrine of the Trinity, (only Mr. Dean,) or to regeneration as Murray did, nor to a general judgment as he did; and Murray did not hold to punishment in a future state. He differed entirely from Mr. Winchester on the subject of misery in the world to come."

Great efforts were put forth to make this new body successful. The conflict was sharp at first, but it gradually declined,

* Preached in Medway, Mass., in May, 1830.

† September 17, 1831.

and Mr. Whittemore says* it "died of itself." But Mr. Adin Ballou dissents from this statement. In the Universalist, February 25, 1871, he says, "Our association greatly prospered in its most important interests for ten years. It met regularly every one of those years, and more than trebled its original number of ministers, etc." And yet he also says that this body was disbanded in 1841, because on the question of "future discipline, etc., " "the tide had turned" in their favor, and that there was no room for "working the machinery of a Restorationist sect between the Unitarians and the Universalists under these changed circumstances."

We confess that these two statements do not seem to agree. Religious bodies are not likely to disband when in a state of prosperity. This association may have had some sympathy from some of the ministers who yet remained in fellowship with the Universalist body, who believed in Restorationism and who probably sometimes met with the new party. Mr. Cobb seems to confirm the statement of Mr. Whittemore. He says,† "They operated in a narrow sphere a little while, and in a few years were only to be found on record, among *the things that were.*"

Such was the end of the last organized effort to advance the doctrine of Restorationism in the Universalist body. Its decease has generally been regarded as a triumph of Rev. Hosea Ballou and his party.

As to the extent to which the doctrine of Restorationism existed in the Universalist denomination from 1830 to 1841 we have several testimonies. Mr. Whittemore, in "The Trumpet," July 3, 1830, says that "a very large majority of their ministers" discarded it. In his "History of Modern Universalism," pp. 439-441, (edition 1830,) he presents an array of testimonies sustaining this view. Mr. Adin Ballou, in the "Universalist," February 11, 1871, alluding to the same year, (1830,) says that "nine tenths" of the denomination were opposed to Restorationism. Mr. Hosea Ballou, in 1841, declared that "the doctrine of Restorationism is generally disbelieved by the Universalists in the United States."‡ These statements seem to accord with the best light that can be obtained from every

* Life of Ballou, vol. iii, p. 90.

† Life of Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, D. D., p. 111.

‡ Life of Whittemore, vol. iii, p. 321.

source. The doctrine of Restoration was retained in some form by a considerable number, but its believers were not numerous, nor were they very active in disseminating their views until a few years later, when, as we shall see in our review of the next period, other changes gradually passed over the denomination, not so radical as in the former period, modifications rather than transformations. 1. The Universalism of the period agreed with the opinions of Murray and Winchester only on one point, namely, the final salvation of all men. 2. The doctrines of Murray and Winchester that this life is a probation, the existence of a personal devil, a local hell, the Trinity, a substitutional atonement, the efficacy of divine grace through faith in Christ, regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, and a future general judgment, were all discarded during this period by Ballou and his followers, and Unitarian views were adopted in place of nearly all of them. 3. Even the Restorationists of this period discarded Mr. Winchester's views of a general judgment, nor did they teach regeneration and other evangelical views, as he did. Mr. Whittemore * admitted that neither party held the above mentioned views as Murray and Winchester did. He also says that "Mr. Ballou was instrumental in changing almost entirely the faith of the whole denomination." †

PERIOD THIRD.—*From 1845 to the present time.*

We had, at first, intended to fix upon 1852, the year of Mr. Ballou's death, as the turning-point between these two periods, but a closer scrutiny of these years has led us to adopt the earlier date as more nearly marking a transitional stage in the denomination. The decline of Mr. Ballou's vigor and the new currents of more modern thought were manifestly working modifications in some of the leading doctrines of the denomination before his death, which were more apparent to none than to him, and were often the occasion of anxious thoughts and admonitions as they had been with Murray before him.

The modifications of this last period seem not to have extended to the doctrines of the Trinity, the atonement, regeneration, a personal devil, a general judgment, in reference to which

* See "Trumpet," Sept. 17, 1831.

† Life of Ballou, vol. ii, p. 88.

they seem to still retain essentially the Unitarian sentiments of the previous period.

EARLY TENDENCIES IN THIS PERIOD.

During the last twelve years of Mr. Ballou's life the question as to the moral condition between the present and the future life was constantly obtruded upon him by correspondents, by the sermons, essays, and speeches of his brethren, and also the Universalist periodicals of that period. In 1844 Rev. Darius Forbes preached a sermon before the Middlesex Quarterly Conference directly upon this question, entering into an elaborate argument to prove that the future life will be shaped by the moral character of this life. Mr. Ballou was very uneasy as he listened to it, and attempted to refute it. But this was only one of many such conflicts.

Soon after he was asked, in a letter, the following close and pertinent question :

Is he who sedulously and practically cultivates his moral and religious nature in this life to be in no better condition in the future than if he had pursued an opposite course and followed the unnatural desires of his depraved animal propensities? *

He replied, "Am I to be blamed for not being able to answer this question? Do the Scriptures say any thing about this subject?" He then went on to quote examples of moral transformations of character, like the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, which he thought bore analogically upon the question, and led him to infer that when "this corruption put on incorruption" all men would enter into a state of holiness and happiness.

This was the great question of the earlier part of the third period, and Mr. Ballou was evidently unable to answer it in a manner which carried conviction to the hearts of his brethren, that there would be no sin or discipline after death, and hence there became a manifest drifting away from the doctrine of immediate happiness after death, which he had so long advocated. Hence, we find Dr. Ballou,† Editor of the "Universalist Quarterly," in 1848, writing that there are indications that the Universalist denomination was entered upon another dogmatic period in its history. He also says,‡ "Within the last few

* Life of Ballou by Whittemore, vol. iv, p. 95.

† A nephew of Hosea Ballou.

‡ "Universalist Quarterly," vol. v, p. 80.

years the current of opinion has run more strongly in favor of a moral connection of the present life with the future."

"Father Ballou" noticed this remark, and was much concerned about it. He endeavored still to stem the tide that was setting in, but in vain. Great respect was entertained for him; his brethren were very kind and conciliatory toward him, but they were fast breaking away from his guidance and thinking for themselves. This question had been the principal point of difference remaining between Mr. Ballou and the Unitarians, and he had held a controversy with Dr. Channing upon it many years before. The surrender of this principle would be the loss of the last doctrine that distinguished them from the Unitarians, and he evidently feared that the Church for which he had spent his life would eventually be fused with them. That he viewed the subject from this stand-point is evident from his valedictory discourse, preached November 10, 1850, in his eightieth year, in which he alludes to the tendency to accept the opinion that men carry into the next world the imperfections of this, so that their moral condition hereafter will depend on the characters which they form while here in the flesh, but that they may and will improve and progress in virtue and holiness in the spirit-world. He then speaks of this tendency as showing "an inclination in some of the professed preachers of Universalism to adopt some of the peculiar opinions of our Unitarian fraternity."

The present status of Universalist belief on

THE FUTURE CONDITION OF THE WICKED

has been a matter of considerable uncertainty in many minds outside their denomination. Of late years so great a variety of statements have been encountered, in conversation with Universalists in their writings and oral discourses, and often too accompanied with a want of patient, clear discrimination on both sides, that the denomination has without doubt sometimes been misrepresented as a body, and many arguments which have been directed against them have undoubtedly, on this account, also fallen powerless, being misdirected. It is, therefore, a matter of some importance at this time to have a clear statement of this question which shall do justice to the denomination, and convey to all minds correct impressions. We may fail in

the attempt, but we have taken considerable pains, by the study of their recent literature, to arrive at correct conceptions of their views, and will venture, in a brief digest, to state the conclusions to which we have arrived.

We apprehend that there exists a variety of views, which may be arranged in several classes.

1. The first class embraces those who hold strictly with Hosea Ballou, that, after death, "there is no other sentient state but that which is called by the blessed names of life and immortality."* This is what has been called the "death and glory" doctrine. To this class belong chiefly the older portion of the denomination, whose earlier associations were with Mr. Ballou. If we are correct in our impressions, but few, if any, of the ministers now hold this view *precisely as Ballou held it*, that is, without some modification.

2. The second class embraces those who seem to be Restorationists; that is, who believe in a state of discipline after death for the wicked. We find, however, that but few of this class like to be called Restorationists, and they are very careful not to use the term punishment. Restorationism, as held by Winchester, as a state of direct penal infliction after a future general judgment, should not be thought of in connection with this modern Restorationism, for they reject both the doctrine of a general judgment and the idea of punishment after death, in this respect following Ballou. Future sufferings will not be penal but disciplinary, is their view.

3. The third class agree with Ballou that there is no punishment, nor even discipline, after death, and that there is only one place for all after we leave this world. They also agree with him in his view of sin, as being chiefly physical in its promptings and workings, while every soul is originally pure, and, however vitiated it may become, will still retain its germs of virtue and piety. While agreeing with Mr. Ballou on all these points, nevertheless they separate from him on the effects of the resurrection. Mr. Ballou taught that sin is like a rotten limb, which will be shuffled off in the transformation which will be effected in the resurrection, when "this corruptible shall put on incorruption," and that all mankind will at once become holy and happy. Separating from Mr. Ballou at this

* Whittemore's Life of Ballou, vol. ii, pp. 28, 29.

point, and contending very strongly that the soul will retain its identity, they hold that men will enter into the other world with the same moral character which they have here—that therefore some will start in the race of eternal life more advantageously than others, but all progressing upward forever. The consequences of wickedness in this life will be different degrees of inferiority and disadvantage in character and condition in the other world, an endless deprivation and loss. No future probation is recognized.

This class probably embraces a large majority of modern Universalists, especially the more thinking and progressive wing of that body, and there is no perceptible difference between their views and those of the progressive Unitarians of the present day, with whom, of late, there have been many attempts to affiliate and unite.*

OTHER POINTS.

The Universalists, like the Unitarians in late years, have adopted a kind of mediatorial phraseology, using the same styles of speech, in reference to theological and religious matters, which prevail among the evangelical sects, but which, when they explain them, plainly designate ideas very different from their evangelical meaning. Such a *pseudo* terminology thus becomes a mere semblance, a masked battery, from which destructive volleys are often fired into unsuspecting souls.

This denomination has suffered more than perhaps any other from the ravages of modern Spiritualism, which seems to have affected, to some extent, the views of many of them even in regard to the soul's condition in the future state. And modern Rationalism has undoubtedly exerted a great influence over a large number of their ministers and members, although not so extensively or so fatally as among the Unitarians. Greater reverence is felt for the Bible among the Universalists as a body.

Within the last period there has been a manifest effort to

* See correspondence and editorials in the "Liberal Christian" during the last five years. The editor of the "Liberal Christian," April 4, 1871, says that the difference between these two bodies now is mainly one of perspective; one putting the doctrine of the salvation of all men in the front ground, and the other reserving it in the back ground.

organize the denomination more fully, to promote a more practical religious life among their people, to make them more devout, and to introduce various forms of social worship, such as prayer and conference meetings, etc. Religious activities have been, to some extent, inaugurated in some of their leading Churches, chiefly in the larger communities, and frequent confessions are heard among them of great wants in the direction of religious life and zeal—"a general lack of heartiness and amplitude in their customary mode of public worship and religious observance" *—that they "do not make their theory a practical force in the denomination," † as they feel that they ought. These and other similar confessions are frequently made without seeming to suspect whether, in departing so far from the true doctrine of the efficacy and power of saving grace, through faith in an atonement for sin, into the barren and lifeless sentimentalism of Socinianism, they have not cut themselves off from the only source of spiritual life and power.

THE PERIODS COMPARED.

In the *last two* periods we have found an agreement in all those doctrines which are essentially Socinian in their character. We find the doctrines of a hell and a future general judgment discarded. In both periods it has been held that men suffer disciplinary punishment for sin in this life, and that regeneration is not a supernatural change wrought by the Holy Ghost, but is merely the beginning of a new life, a ceasing to do evil and learning to do well.

The disagreements of the doctrines of the *third* period from those of the *second* period are not numerous. They are, 1. The old doctrine of "death and glory" is not so distinctly set forth. The objective aspect of the denomination is more expressive of some kind of correction, or, at least, of moral culture after death. 2. Restorationism is more generally accepted than during the second period. 3. The moral connection between this life and the next, and the state of progression to which reference has been made, and which is now probably the more current view of the future state, was almost wholly unknown in the second period under Ballou.

* *The Universalists' Centennial*, p. 13.

† *Ibid.*, p. 72.

Between the *second* and the *first* periods we have noticed radical differences: the rejection of the doctrine of depravity, the Trinity, the atonement, as substitutional and expiatory; regeneration by the Holy Ghost, a personal devil, a local hell, a general judgment, as held by Murray and Winchester, the adoption of modern Socinianism, and the happiness of all men at death. Only one point of doctrinal agreement runs through all the periods, namely: *The final holiness and happiness of all men.* How great is the contrast between the earliest and the present phases of Universalism!

The modern school of Restorationists have very decidedly rejected Mr. Winchester, representing his views as monstrous, and holding them up to ridicule. Thus have they disowned him who, more than any other individual, has been the founder of their system in this country. The following extract will show the contrast between the founder and his followers. Mr. Winchester says: "Ques. Is the lake of fire and brimstone real or figurative? Ans. Real, by all means, according to the literal sense of Scripture."* Again, "They are cast alive into a lake of fire and brimstone, where they shall be constantly tormented, day and night, to the ages of ages, without cessation. . . . As the lake of fire is the last punishment which shall be inflicted upon rebels, none that enter there can ever be loosed from it until they are wholly subdued."†

MR. MURRAY DISOWNED BY HIS CHILDREN.

As early as 1841, Mr. Ballou, referring to Murray and Winchester, said, "The particular opinions about which these fathers of our Israel differed are now generally disbelieved by Universalists in the United States."‡ In the same year, and only twenty-six years after the death of Murray, it became a question which awakened considerable debate, whether an ordaining council ought to hesitate to ordain a preacher who held to Mr. Murray's type of Universalism. Mr. Whittemore says: § "Father Ballou supposed that it would not be prudent to ordain such, except over societies of similar views, or societies who understood the candidate to hold the peculiar opinions to which

* Winchester on Prophecies, vol. i, p. 223.

† Ibid., vol. i, p. 227.

‡ Life of Ballou, vol. iii, p. 321.

§ Ibid., p. 319.

we have referred. There seems, however, to have been but little need of raising that question, as a Universalist of that kind could scarcely have been found at the time of which we write."

But, at the present time, the contrast is undoubtedly still more striking, and doctrines such as Murray and Winchester preached would not now be endured in Universalist congregations. Rev. G. L. Demarest, in his Introduction to the Centenary Edition of the Life of Murray, referring to his doctrinal views, says: * "It is probable that no living man or woman now entertains them in their wholeness." "Mr. Murray's peculiar opinions were not of a character to secure a permanent hold of the public mind, or largely to affect a thinking people." This is certainly a very frank, though humiliating, acknowledgment to make, in the face of a centennial celebration in recognition of Mr. Murray's fatherhood of the denomination. But the fact acknowledged is a patent one. Let us now see

THE FATHER OF UNIVERSALISM DISOWNING HIS CHILDREN.

Had Mr. Murray appeared among them at any time during the last thirty-five or forty years he could hardly have recognized them as his children either in doctrine or spirit. Even Mr. Demarest, referring to the Unitarian tendencies which had begun to appear in Murray's life-time, says: † "He was so earnest in his faith, and in each item of it, that he could not view with indifference the evident departure of the Church which he had organized from it. He especially viewed 'Socinianism' with abhorrence, and professed *more sympathy with Calvinistic Partialism than with Unitarian Universalism.*"

But Mr. Murray shall speak in his own words. As we began with Mr. Murray, it is fitting that we close with him. The following extract is very pertinent. It is from a pamphlet published by him in Boston in 1791, entitled "Hints Relative to the Forming of a Christian Church; and an answer to the question, What constitutes a Universalist?" Referring to those who advocate the salvation of men after a period of punishment after death, he says:

* Page 13.

† Page 338.

They cannot, we conceive, with any degree of propriety, be called Universalists on apostolic principles; nor does it appear that they have any idea of being saved by or in the Lord with an everlasting, or with any salvation. It is difficult to find what they will have to thank God for at last, they having paid their own debt, and in their own persons satisfied Divine justice.

Such Universalists have nothing to do with the ministry of reconciliation; the doctrine of the atonement and the acceptance of the Beloved is out of their plan.

Such Universalists as these are as far from the doctrines of the Gospel as their opponents, (the Partialists.) These are Pharisaical Universalists, who are willing to justify themselves, and such Universalism as this will be more acceptable to an adulterous generation than the Universalism found in the ministry of reconciliation.—Pp. 40, 41.



ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Review.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, April, 1871. (New York.)—

1. The Miracles of Christ "Critically Examined."
2. Life and Times of David Zeisberger.
3. The Moabite Stone.
4. Newman's Grammar of Assent.
5. The Constitution of the Person of Christ.
6. The Writings of Solomon.
7. Professional Ethics and their Application to Legal Practice.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, April, 1871. (Andover.)—1. Free Public Libraries.

2. Justice—What is It?
3. The Church-membership of Baptized Children.
4. The Idea of Christ's Kingdom on Earth, in Itself and in its History, Proof that it is from God.
5. Our Lord's Sacred Prayer—a New Critical Text, Digest, and Translation.
6. Methods of Perpetuating an Interest in Hearing the Gospel.
7. Memorial of Dr. Samuel Harvey Taylor.
8. Notes on Egyptology.
9. Biblical Intelligence—England.

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1871. (Gettysburgh.)—1. The Theistic

- Argument from Final Causes.
2. Home Missionary Organization.
3. The Proposed Religious Amendment to our National Constitution.
4. Union in the Lutheran Church.
5. The Intermediate State.
6. The Assurance of Faith.
7. The Pastor of the Future.

MERCERSBURGH REVIEW, April, 1871. (Philadelphia.)—1. Schleiermacher, and the

- Theology of the Mercersburgh Review.
2. The American College on the Defensive.
3. The Vine and the Husbandman.
4. The Creed and Dogmatic Theology.
5. Rebekah.
6. Heaven Viewed under a Local Aspect.
7. The Pilot.
8. The Forty Days after the Resurrection.
9. The Pericopes, or Selections of Gospels and Epistles for the Church Year.
10. The Book of Jonah.

NEW ENGLANDER, April, 1871. (New Haven.)—1. Winthrop and Emerson on Forefathers' Day.

2. The Sign Language.
3. Professor Fitch as a Preacher.
4. The Christian and the Ante-Messianic Dispensations Compared.
5. A Long Range Shot: Blackwood's Magazine on the "Blue Laws."
6. Richard Grant White on Words and their Uses.
7. Yale College: Some Thoughts respecting its Future.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1871. (Boston.)—1. An Erie Raid.

2. On the Origin and Growth of Public Opinion in Prussia.
3. Mr. Bryant's Translation of the Iliad.
4. Modern Architecture.
5. Lawyer and Client.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, April, 1871. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Sources of Error in Theology. 2. Ministerial Character of Christ Practically Considered. 3. Cumberland Presbyterianism furnishes the Best Key of Interpretation. 4. The Adaptation of the Scriptures to Man's Entire Spiritual Nature. 5. Ministerial Support. 6. The Divinity of Christ. 7. The Christian Ministry of the Future. 8. "I Am that I Am." 9. The Foreknowledge and Decrees of God.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, April, 1871. A. T. BLEDSOE, LL.D., Editor, (Baltimore, Md.) —1. The Suffering and the Salvation of Infants. 2. Americanisms. 3. The Latin Races in America. 4. Whedon on The Will. 5. Volcanoes and Earthquakes. 6. Beware of the Tropics. 7. The Reviewers Reviewed. 8. Thoughts Suggested by Recent Events.

Under guise of a review of "Whedon on the Will," Dr. Bledsoe has thought it wise to furnish an extended and very bitter, but very weak, personal attack upon the writer of that work. Every syllable of the onslaught is swelling with malignity; nor from end to end is there one generous expression, or one commendatory phrase which is not an intended sneer. The author of the "Will" is "a dull man," "a pedant," "a pretender;" writes not English but "Whedonese," surrenders the whole question in his argument, and has furnished not one "new thought" or valuable idea which is not *stolen from Bledsoe's Theodicy!* Thrice he applies to the author or his work a cognate of the term *thief*; namely, *thieving, thievish, and theft*. The entire tirade of pseudo-criticism is unworthy to occupy an extended notice in our pages; but when Dr. B. thus abdicates all courtesy by applying terms of *moral opprobrium* which no Christian gentleman uses to another, he cannot expect that courtesy will for a moment stand in the way of a very explicit expression of truth in reply. The issue then, made by him, is this: Either the author of the "Will" is guilty of theft, or Dr. Bledsoe is guilty of falsehood; and holding the last of these propositions to be true, we proceed to nail him, as a falsifier, to the wall.

Dr. Bledsoe makes the following statement: "When Dr. Whedon asked us, before the war, if he was not 'very much abused down South,' we were compelled to reply that 'we could not tell,' as we had 'never heard his name mentioned in the South.'" On this we note: 1. Dr. Bledsoe here transgresses one of the laws of civilized society in publishing language confessedly uttered in private conversation, intentionally to the utterer's disparagement, and thus entitles himself to have the door shut against him by all honorable persons as an *eavesdropper*.

2. His story is a sheer fabrication, for we never saw Dr. Bledsoe "before the war." 3. Though we can easily believe, upon his own statement, that he could be guilty of the courtesy of such a reply, yet that he ever in fact made such a reply to us he very well knows to be a falsehood. We never held any such conversation with him nor with any one else. 4. The only time, or times, we ever saw Dr. B. was in our office, and once in another room of our Book Concern, *since* the war. We then supposed, and do not now know to the contrary, that he came direct from England, and had not lately been in the South. We were much more likely to ask him about the fallen fortunes of rebeldom in London than to inquire about our own reputation among our "rebel" brethren in Southrondom. 5. It may serve to explain what cause has set Dr. Bledsoe's mendacities in such rapid flow for us to narrate that *he came to our office to offer an article for our Quarterly*. He had a dilapidated and mendicant look, as if he had truly "been through the wars," and we felt sympathetically inclined to befriend him. We received his article, prepared to judge it favorably. It belonged to the department of Natural Theology; but we regretted to find that the writer ignored, or, perhaps, was ignorant of, the new phases that subject had received from the writings of Mill, Herbert Spencer, Darwin, and others, and that his essay was suited only to the year one of this present century. We were obliged, therefore, as courteously as possible, to tell him that his production was behind the age, and unsuited to the advanced position of our own readers. He took it, and, with a toss, departed. Now it has been our own lot to have our articles rejected without loss of friendship for the rejecter; but that, we apprehend, is a magnanimity of which Dr. Bledsoe has no conception.

Dr. Bledsoe says, "The book was handed to us by one of the publishers, and till then we had never received the least intimation of its existence." Now as the book was, within a year or two of its publication, reviewed in extensive articles, not only in the "Methodist Quarterly Review," but in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," the "New Englander," the "American Presbyterian Quarterly," the "Danville Quarterly," and the "Princeton Review;" as it has stood for years on the Course of Study of the Methodist Episcopal Church; as it has been a text-

book in several of our Methodist Theological Seminaries, and has been the subject of regular theological Lectures in several Calvinistic Seminaries, it is plain that Dr. Bledsoe's confession furnishes the measure not of the notoriety of the book but of his own profound ignorance.

Our *thefts*, as charged by Dr. Bledsoe, appear to be three.

1. The first "theft" Dr. Bledsoe makes out by three expedients—a mutilation of our words, an interpolation of his own words into ours, and a falsehood; namely, an assurance given to the reader that our idea and his are identical when it is perfectly plain that they are not identical. His idea is this: *Had not a Redeemer been given, the human race would probably not have been created.* Our idea is this: *Had not a Redeemer been given, Adam would probably not have been permitted to beget posterity.* Our idea, as our readers well know, is *one of the commonplaces of Methodist theology*, clearly and repeatedly expressed by Fletcher, Watson, and Wilbur Fisk, as well as in the second volume of our own commentary. Dr. Bledsoe's theory is the *non-creation* of man; the Methodist theory is the *non-continuity* of the race from Adam after the fall.

Dr. Bledsoe's passage, affirmed by him to have been stolen in the "Will," is as follows:

"It is frequently said, we are aware, that if it had not been for the redemption of the world by a 'sovereign, gracious' dispensation, the whole race of man might have been justly exposed to the torments of hell forever. But where is the proof? Is it found in the word of God? No, the answer is emphatically intended to be; there is no proof; and in the Scripture no answer, explicit or otherwise. What would become of them, then, without a Saviour?" Now the reply to this question, as there given, is the same as the one given above by Dr. Whedon. "If there had been no salvation through Christ, as a part of the actual constitution and system of the world, then there would have been no other part of that system whatever. . . . The work of Christ is the great sun and center of the system as *it is*; and if this had never been a part of the original grand design, we do not know that the planets would have been created to wander in eternal darkness. We do not know that ever the justice of God would have created man, and permitted him to fall, wandering everlasting amid the horrors of the second death, without hope and without remedy. We find nothing of the sort in the word of God; and in our own nature it meets no response, except a wail of unutterable horror."—P. 371.

The following comments are a small but fair specimen of Dr. Bledsoe's self-inflated and prolix jubilations of our *thefts*:

Behold, then, the reply of Dr. Whedon as distinctly and emphatically expressed as possible! Behold, as he is pleased to call it, his "satisfactory and beautiful solution!" "How two minds run together!" Both independent and original, and yet both run together in "a sort of pre-established harmony!" We gave ourselves some little credit for the solution, and deemed it original, (never having

seen it elsewhere,) until we found that Dr. Whedon had hit on precisely the same solution!—P. 371.

The following is the half paragraph as quoted by him from the “Will,” with his misguiding interpolations in parenthesis:

What would have been done with them (the whole fallen race of man) without a Saviour? is a question to which revelation furnishes no explicit answer. And yet there are grounds both from Scripture and reason for an obvious reply. The human race would never have been brought into existence under conditions of such misery. In other words, the redemption was the condition of the actual continuity (creation and continuance?) of the race. Redemption underlies probationary existence. Grace is the basis of nature. *And the reply is both a satisfactory and a beautiful theoretical solution of a theoretical difficulty.*—Pp. 370, 371.

The part cut off from our paragraph to prevent detection of the fraud contains the following words: “It” (the race) “can come from a potential and *seminal* existence only under the universal law of hereditary likeness to the lineal parent.” Our full paragraph, therefore, questioned not the “creation and continuance,” (as he interpolates,) but the “continuity” of the race from “the lineal parent.”

But be it that the ideas are identical, and that we have stolen from Dr. Bledsoe; we are then in the company of a noble set of thieves.

The first of these thieves—Dr. Wilbur Fisk—stole the idea from Dr. Bledsoe before he ever published, as follows:

We, on the contrary, believe that by Adam's unnecessitated sin he, and in him all his posterity, became obnoxious to the curse of the Divine law. As the first man sinned personally and actively, he was personally condemned; but as his posterity had no agency or personal existence, they could only have perished seminally in him. By the promise of a Saviour, however, our federal head was restored to the possibility of obtaining salvation through faith in the Redeemer. And in this restoration *all* the seminal generations of men were included. Their possible and prospective existence was restored, and their personal and active existence secured.—Pp. 52, 53.

Thief second—Richard Watson—stole it before Dr. Bledsoe ever wrote, as follows:

The only actual beings to be charged with sin, “the transgression of the law,” were Adam and Eve; for the rest of the human race, not being actually existent, were not capable of transgressing; or if they were, in a vague sense, capable of it by virtue of the federal character of Adam, yet then only as *potential* and not as *actual* beings—beings, as the logicians say, *in posse*, not *in esse*. Our first parents rendered themselves liable to eternal death. This is granted; and had they died “IN THE DAY” they sinned, which, but for the introduction of a system of mercy and long-suffering, and the appointment of a new kind of probation, for any thing that appears, they must have done, the human race would have perished with them, and the only conscious sinners would have been the only conscious sufferers.—P. 395.

Thief third—John Fletcher—stole it from Dr. Bledsoe repeatedly before Dr. Bledsoe was born; for instance, as follows:

As we sinned only *seminally* in Adam, if God had not intended our redemption, his goodness would have engaged him to destroy us *seminally*, by crushing the capital offender who contained us all: so there would have been a just proportion between the sin and punishment; for as we sinned in Adam without the least consciousness of guilt, so in him we should have been punished without the least consciousness of pain. But the moment we allow that the blessing of the second Adam is as general as the curse of the first . . . he spares guilty Adam to propagate the fallen race, that they may share the blessings of a better covenant.—Pp. 146, 147.

The only escape which Dr. Bledsoe can here make from a conviction of multiplied dishonesties is by a plea of sheer *ignorance*! He was unaware of this well-known tenet of Methodism! And that would be coming down from a very lofty pedestal indeed. He, the tall Colossus, who assumes to stride and straddle over Southern Methodism; the great arbiter of Arminian theology, competent to blast at breath the reputations of years, is obliged to confess his ignorance of the very horn-books of our evangelical Arminian system, thinks he invented the Methodist doctrines, and charges the normal promulgators of those doctrines with stealing them from him!!! Let Albert T. Bledsoe beware how he ever again applies to another the epithet “*Pretender*.”

Our second theft is the appropriating the simile in the first two lines of the following passage: “*The free actions of men are clearly reflected back in the mirror of the divine omniscience*; they are not projected forward from the engine of the divine omnipotence.” Dr. Bledsoe expatiates over the love we show for this stolen trinket in dallying with it over the whole of our page 291. He might have added that we show still farther love for it by using it twice on page 14, being the second page of our treatise; so that if we have stolen it once we have stolen it three times.* What is more flagrant still, we stole it, this last *twice*, more than ten years before his “Theodicy” was

* “As when we place the object before a fixed mirror, the mirror forthwith presents the correspondent image, so when we place the object before the fixed intelligence, the intelligence forthwith presents the perception. . . . As when you place an externality before the mind the idea arises, as when you place an object before a mirror the image necessarily arises, so when you present before the Will the motive, the volition as necessarily springs forth.”—P. 14.

“God’s mind, according to the ‘eternal now,’ is like this mirror, before which I may stand. Every movement of my head, hand, body is reflected with perfect accuracy according as that movement is by me freely and alternatively made.”—P. 291.

The fact that in two cases the object is placed before a finite, and in the third before an infinite, intelligence does not affect the sameness of the image.

published, and about fifteen years before we had read a page of that immortal book! Many of our readers may recollect the statement given by Professor Newhall, published soon after the appearance of our volume, narrating the commencement of the work as having taken place, at the earnest instance of the late Dr. Fisk, during our Professorship at the Wesleyan University. The work was prosecuted, at intervals, through a period of twenty years; and the first two pages, in which our double theft from Dr. Bledsoe occurs, were written earlier than 1840, while his book was published in 1853, and never opened by us until some time after our election, in 1856, to the editorship of this Quarterly. When, in the year 1863, the last finishing was given to our MS. for the press, these first pages were carefully copied from the first draft, and the author remarked to the copyist, (his own son,) "What you are now copying was written before you were born." It is but just to say, however, that Dr. Bledsoe could not have known those dates; and that the main blame in this matter lies upon the puerility of the fuss he makes over such a trifle, and the coarseness of the terms and baseness of the spirit in which he has expressed the charge.

Dr. Bledsoe's third charge of theft is characterized by manifold dishonesties. He does not give our words which he says we purloined from him; he gives only our heading to our argument; then gives his own words in full; then attempts by sophistical reasoning to hoodwink his readers into the belief that his words accord *with the heading*. We shall give both sides, and enable the reader to judge whether Dr. Bledsoe does not commit a conscious falsehood in his statement. His passage, as by himself given, is as follows, numbered by our own pen for easier reference:

1. "If God foreknows that our actions will come to pass in the way we call freely, . . . then, as foreknowledge infers necessity, our actions are necessarily free. And surely, if the necessity which is inferred from foreknowledge is predicable of freedom, it cannot be inconsistent with it."

2. "In conclusion, the necessitarian takes the wrong course in his inquiries, and lays his premises in the dark. To illustrate this point: I know that I act, and hence I conclude that God foreknew that I would act. And again, I know that my act is not necessitated, that it does not necessarily proceed from the action or influence of causes, and hence I conclude that God foreknew that I would thus act freely, in precisely this manner, and not otherwise. Thus I reason from what I do know to what I do not know, from my foreknowledge of the actual world as it is, up to God's foreknowledge respecting it.

3. "The necessitarian pursues the opposite course. He reasons from what he does not know, that is, from the particulars of the divine foreknowledge, about which he absolutely knows nothing *a priori*, down to the facts of the actual world. Thus, quitting the light which shines so brightly within us and around us, he seeks for light in the midst of impenetrable darkness. He endeavors to determine the phenomena of the world, not by looking at them and seeing what they are, but by deducing conclusions from God's infinite foreknowledge respecting them!"

4. "In doing this a grand illusion is practiced, by his merely supposing that the volitions themselves are foreknown, without taking into the supposition the whole of the case, and recollecting that God not only foresees all our actions, *but also all about them*. For if this were done, if it were remembered that he not only foresees that our volitions will come to pass, *but also how they will come to pass*, the necessitarian would see that nothing could be proved in this way except what is first tacitly assumed. This grand illusion would vanish, and it would be clearly seen that if the argument from foreknowledge proves any thing, it just as well proves the *necessity of freedom* as any thing else."

5. "Indeed it does seem to me, that it is one of the most wonderful phenomena in the history of the human mind, that, in reasoning about facts in relation to which the most direct and palpable sources of evidence are open before us, so many of its brightest ornaments should so long have endeavored to draw conclusions from 'the dark unknown' of God's foreknowledge, without perceiving that this is to reject the true method, to invert the true order of inquiry, and to involve the inquirer in all the darkness and confusion inseparable therefrom: without perceiving that no powers, however great, that no genius, however exalted, can possibly extort from such a method any thing but the dark, and confused, and perplexing exhibitions of an ingenious logomachy."—Pp. 374, 375.

Our argument is as follows:

We may first remark that *our view of free agency does not so much require in God a foreknowledge of a peculiar kind of event, as a knowledge in him of a PECULIAR QUALITY EXISTENT IN THE FREE AGENT*. This is a point apparently much, if not entirely, overlooked by thinkers upon this subject.

Power is a substantive quality intrinsic in the agent possessing it. It is a positive element in the constitution of the being. To a knowing eye it may be perfectly cognizable. If any power be planted in an agent, God, who placed it there, must know it. And if that power be, as we shall assume to have proved, a power to do otherwise than the agent really does, God may be conceived to know it, and to know it in every specific instance. That is, God knows in every case that the agent who wills a certain way possessed the elemental power of choosing another way, or several elemental powers of choosing several other ways. God may know the way in which the agent will act, and at the same time there may be seen by him in the same agent the substantive power of acting otherwise instead. The two facts, namely, that *he will act thus*, and that *there resides in him the power of other action*, may be seen at the same time by God and be mutually consistent with each other. God's foreknowledge, therefore, of the volition which will be put forth is perfectly consistent with his knowledge of the agent's power of willing otherwise. That is, prescience in God is perfectly consistent with freedom in the finite agent.

Surely if an agent can will either one of several ways, God may know each one of those several ways; and if of those several ways there is one which the agent will *will*, God may know which that way is. His knowing the way which, of the several, the agent will choose, does not negative his knowing that the agent possessed powers for either of the other ways. For all those powers are simply positive elements in the being of the agent, which God is certainly to be conceived as able to know.

This view reduces the whole question to discussion of man's nature, or the proper analysis of the nature of a free agent. It becomes a discussion not of the metaphysics of events in regard to their necessity or possibility, but of psychology or anthroplogy; or rather (what is of momentous consequence in the controversy) the psychological investigation and decision overrule and predetermine the meta-

physical. If there be, in the free agent, ascertainable by psychology, or required by intuition, or supposably seen by the divine eye, the power of putting forth the volition with full power of alterity, then God knows that power. And then God knows, or knows not, the agent's future acts. If he knows them not, his foreknowledge does not extend to all free acts. If he does know them, then he knows the future act which will be, while there is full adequate power for it not to be.—*Whedon on the Will*, pp. 271-273.

Dr. Bledsoe's paragraph 1. simply argues that God's foreknowledge proves man's "necessary freedom;" an argument, certainly, which we have not thought worth the stealing. In paragraph 2: he tells us that the necessitarian ought to reason from our free acts to foreknowledge; and, paragraph 3. not from foreknowledge down to our actions; if he did the former, (paragraph 4.) he would see that God would foresee our actions as they come to pass—namely, *freely*—and foreknowledge would prove nothing but "necessary freedom." Paragraph 5. is simply a vague tirade against necessitarian reasoning. Now that the idea of freedom should control the notion of foreknowledge, and not *vice versa*, is indeed an old view, lying in fact as the basis of the denial, by a class of thinkers, of foreknowledge. They hold the two to be incompatible, and from the conscious reality of freedom they overrule and nullify foreknowledge. It is the inferring "necessary freedom" from foreknowledge, which, so far as we know, is alone original with Dr. Bledsoe, and of that he enjoys an untouched monopoly.

First, the premise of Dr. Bledsoe's argument is about God's *foreknowledge*; whereas, according to our very heading, the very purpose of ours is to *exclude God's foreknowledge*, and include God's *present perception* of a present object, namely, *a power* in men; and second, Dr. Bledsoe's argument stays within *events*, namely, *free actions*; whereas it is the very object of our argument, as our heading says, to shut out *events* and speak only of a *thing* or *quality*, namely, that same *power*. So fixedly do we concentrate the argument upon the thing *power*, that the word *power* occurs eight times in the first paragraph; and action is mentioned only to define the *power*. And the very terms of our heading aim to *shut out* the consideration of "foreknowledge" and include a present "knowledge."

The passage above quoted from our book, let it be noted, stands as a *prelude* to an argument of twenty pages on God's foreknowledge. The purpose of the *prelude* is to cut off our opponent *at start* by showing that, for our own part, *we* are not

bound to argue that question of foreknowledge at all, and that our doing so is purely *ex gratia*. Our reasoning in this prelude is this: That foreknowledge argument is all about "*events*," their certainty, their contingency, their necessity, their freedom, their susceptibility of foreknowledge, etc.; whereas the question is not about a future "*event*," but a *present existing* THING; nor is it about God's foreknowledge, but about God's *present perception* of that *thing*.

God, we argue, may look into man and see that *thing* the alternative *power*, just as a manufacturer may look into a machine and see a *peg* or a *double spring*. Upon that substantive *power* God, like a machinist, may put his finger. It is, therefore, a question of the constituents that make up the human fabric; not a question of the metaphysics of "*events*." And the logical result is, we are under no obligation to touch foreknowledge of "*events*" at all. If, however, our opponent insist on foreknowledge of a future "*event*," we reply: Nevertheless, *there is the peg*. If God foreknows the future action, he also sees, *with present perception*, the peg in the machine, the permanent counter power. Be it then, if our opponent will, that God foreknows a vast variety of man's volitions, he also perceives *that everlasting peg*, the attendant element in the make of the man. The event is an event with a peg to it; an act *from* the agent, with a tangible element *in* the agent. Now of this argument Dr. Bledsoe never had the slightest conception. He did not understand it when he read it; and he never will understand it, unless we shall have at last succeeded in galvanizing it into his brain.

Dr. Bledsoe's paragraphs, from beginning to end, are full of terms and phrases which the very terms of our head proposition excluded, and which would entirely disconcert our argument, such as "*our actions*," "*all about them*," that is, actions, "*HOW they will come to pass*," etc. He always concludes with a result which our argument knows nothing of, namely, our "*necessary freedom*;" and he utterly unknowns the entire point at which we aimed, namely, our perfect exemption from all obligation even to touch the question of God's foreknowledge.

That Dr. Bledsoe is made to appear thus disgracefully before our readers is no fault of ours. With the conductors of the

Southern Methodist Quarterly Review, Drs. Doggett and Summers successively, we had some free passages of criticism, but never a discourteous word. The reason is—they appeared as Christian gentlemen, and uttered nothing unworthy of that character. To Dr. Bledsoe belongs a coarse, heavy, malignant, mendacious nature, that compels men to deal with him according to his nature. Our impression is that the Southern Church, so far as she accepts him, will find him a very heavy elephant on her hands. His silly burlesque of criticism upon our style and argument passes untouched, from its worthlessness. On those points, as upon his charges, it would be easy to send him, as we now send him, limping and howling from the encounter.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, April, 1871. (Cincinnati.)—1. Origin of the Human Soul and Anthropology. 2. Ignatius Loyola and John Wesley. 3. Relation of Faith and Salvation. 4. The Gospel the Power of God; or, The Process of Regeneration. 5. Bible Doctrine of Divorce. 6. Mount Moriah.

The "Christian Quarterly" is the organ of the Campbellite denomination, which we are informed is considered in some parts of our country to be quite a respectable sect. Hereabouts it is not considered an essential part of a first-class theological education to know what they believe or teach. But their Quarterly in external appearance, and in the intellectual power and scholarship displayed, though markedly inferior in this last item to our own periodical, does honor to its constituency and its conductors. Considering this unquestionable inferiority to us in the range of its scholarly departments, we think their getting off the following utterance exhibits a very admirable degree of self-possession :

Methodism has not furnished men of the highest order of scholarship, and its many Advocates, monthlies, and Quarterly occupy only a respectable rank among papers of the same kind. *Attempts were once made to raise the Quarterly in point of scholarship, but they had to be abandoned, because there were scarcely any readers for a Quarterly thus conducted.*

A comparison of the bound volumes of this Quarterly will show that immediately after the election of the present editor to succeed the late accomplished Dr. M'Clintock, the departments presupposing a high scholarship on the part of its readers were *not diminished, but enlarged and elevated.* Our subscription list will show that within two years thereafter our number of subscribers was about doubled. There never has been a time in its entire history when its range of scholarship was higher than now;

it shrinks from comparison, in some respects, with no denominational Quarterly in the country; and if any modification is to take place in this respect, it will be in the future, *as in our entire past*, in the direction of advancement and not of retrogression. The "Christian Quarterly" has now the opportunity of showing its love for truth by doing itself the honor of correcting its calumnious misstatement.

But when they have fairly begun to correct, they would do well to finish by canceling the whole article of "Ignatius Loyola and John Wesley." Yet let it stand, draped in black lines, as a memento how intensely sectarian an "unsectarian" sect can be.

• • •

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1871. (London.)—1. The Reconstruction of the Irish Episcopal Church. 2. The Theory of Practice. 3. The Native Christians of India as a Community and a Church. 4. The Union of Churches. 5. The Late Controversy on the Fatherhood of God as Manifested in Scripture. 6. The Continental Missions of the Early Celtic Church. 7. Scottish Moderatism. *Reprinted Articles:* 1. Sinaiitic Inscriptions. 2. Address of Professor Tholuck of Halle, on the Occasion of his Jubilee, December 2, 1870.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Burton's History of Scotland. 2. Early English Texts. 3. Parties in the Episcopal Church. 4. Ingoldsby. 5. The Downfall of Bonapartism. 6. Religious Tests and National Universities. 7. The War of 1870—1. 8. Bishop Berkeley. 9. The Future of Europe.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1871. (London.)—1. The Systematic Examination of the Holy Land. 2. Icelandic Sagas. 3. Rome and the Temporal Power. 4. Bulwer's Life of Palmerston. 5. Bunting's Memorials. 6. Modern Armies. 7. Biblical Theology. 8. Half a Year of Modern History.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury. 2. Evidence from Handwriting—Junius. 3. The Third French Republic, and the Second German Empire. 4. New Sources of English History. 5. Civil List Pensions. 6. The Church and Nonconformity. 7. The Usages of War. 8. The Chronology of the Gospels. 9. The Satires of Horace: Professor Conington and Mr. Theodore Martin. 10. The Hundred Years of Christianity in Japan. 11. The Government Army Bill.

The Letters of Junius, vigorous English though they are, owe more of their permanent notoriety to the mystery of their authorship than to their surpassing ability. For many years it has been a well-established opinion that the writer was Sir Philip Francis. Lord Brougham asserted long since that the case made would convict him before the courts. The question may be considered as forever settled by a thorough investigation of comparative handwritings by a skillful expert, Mr. Chabot. Mr. Chabot's published

investigation is remarkable, and suggestive as an exercitation in a peculiar class of subtle Logic. It is clear that Junius is written in a systematically disguised hand, and Mr. Chabot, by comparison of the Junius letters with a large quantity of Sir Philip's genuine writings, first detects a large number of inadvertent resemblances in the disguise, regularly recurring, and classifies them; next he detects the entire system of rules which Sir Philip adopted in order to establish the disguise; and the whole comes out so intuitively certain as to form essentially a demonstration. There would be no dissent among any number of sound minds. The article on the subject is highly interesting.

As regards the world's, or at least Europe's, being ruled by a set of old gentlemen, the first article hits off the following paragraph:

It is the remark of Gibbon that every man who rises above the common level has received two educations: the first from his teachers; the second, more personal and important, from himself. Shaftesbury may be cited in confirmation of this theory, and he is also a striking instance of the precocity which occurs, or at all events is made prominent, so much more frequently in preceding generations than in our own. This is pre-eminently the age of septuagenarian, almost octogenarian, statesmen and generals; but we can no longer boast of youthful orators, ministers, heroes, and conquerors, like Fox, Pitt, Condé, and Napoleon; nor of men of mark marrying, settling, and taking up a distinguished position, public or private, in their teens. Shaftesbury was under eighteen when he married, under nineteen when he took his seat in the House of Commons, and hardly thirteen when he intervened personally in the management of his property, sadly mismanaged by his guardians, and succeeded in wresting a large slice from the grasp of an uncle who had hoped to plunder him through the connivance of the Court of Wards.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Aristophanes. 2. The American Republic—Its Strength and Weakness. 3. Thomas Hood. 4. Battles in the Church. 5. Public School Teaching. 6. France, the Jesuits, and the Tientsin Massacre. 7. Ste. Beuve. 8. Army Organization.

Tyerman's Life of Wesley is thus noticed from the skeptical *Westminster's* stand-point:

John Wesley, the founder of the Methodists, was born the year after young Bonwickie was placed at Merchant Taylors' School. The incidents in his life down to the year 1748 have been recounted in the first volume of Mr. Tyerman's biography. The second volume opens with some account of Wesley's peregrinations in Somersetshire, Wales, and Ireland, and the persecutions undergone by himself and his adherents at the hands of the drunken and ruffianly persons composing the mobs that conducted the cowardly and nearly murderous assaults to which the early Methodists were exposed. It abounds in unconscious pictures of life and manners, which reflect but too often little credit on "poor human nature." Mr. Tyerman has arranged his copious and minute information under separate years, the events of each year forming a distinct chapter. If the book thus put together is rather a miscellaneous compilation than the well-proportioned result of discriminating study and constructive skill, we have at least the advantage of the ready reference offered by the chronological sequence of the story, and of the abundance of curiously illustrative matter which Mr. Tyerman's inclusive process of composition insures. The growth of Methodism, the opposition it encountered, the singular mental phenomena which it excited, the multifarious activity of Wes-

ley, the enthusiasm of preachers and professors, the relations in which Wesley and Whitefield stood to each other, the connection with Count Zinzendorf and Moravianism, the strange experiences in public and private life, the variety of incident and adventure, and the traits of character which distinguished the collective and individual humanity of the last century, are all exemplified in the careless redundancy of Mr. Tyerman's narrative. The figures of remarkable men and women fit by as we turn over the pages. Horace Walpole, the Countess of Huntingdon. Mehetabel Wesley, Grace Murray, Dr. Conyers Middleton, Venn, Hervey, Foote, Dr. Dodd, are among the number. In a letter written by George Whitefield, dated 1751, we find scriptural warrant for slaveholding adduced. Not only is the example of Abraham quoted in support of the practice, but the perpetual slavery of the Gibeonites is cited as a precedent, and the implied sanction of the apostles for the usage asserted to support the writer's own view. Satisfied that hot countries cannot be cultivated without negroes, and reflecting that though "liberty is a sweet thing to such as are born free, yet to those who never knew the sweets of it, slavery, perhaps, may not be so irksome." Whitefield, we are told, acted upon the principle propounded, and at the time of his decease, twenty years afterward, was the possessor of seventy-five slaves, in connection with his Orphan House plantations on the Georgian settlements. We are happy to say that Wesley's opinion of the peculiar institution was very different from that of his Calvinistic colleague.

◆◆◆

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) 1871. Third Number.—*Essays:*
 1. RIEHM, The Cherubs in the Tabernacle and in the Temple. 2. HENRICHSEN, The Relation of the Jews to Alexander the Great. *Thoughts and Remarks:*
 1. LEIMBACH, Tertullian's Idea of Sacrament. 2. ROHRICHT, The Johannine Logos Doctrine. 3. OPPERT, Concerning Chedorlaomer. *Reviews:* 1. Zumpt Geburtsjahr Christi, (Birth-year of Christ;) Reviewed by ROSCH. 2. SCHULTZ, Altestamentliche Theologie, (Old Testament;) Reviewed by DIESTEL. 3. KIENLEN, *Commentaire Historique et Critique sur l'Apocalypse*, (Historical and Critical Commentary on the Apocalypse;) Reviewed by Dusterdick.

The recent theological literature of Germany is rich in essays on the nature of Cherubs. The opinion that the Cherubs must be regarded as beings of real existence has recently been defended by a number of prominent Lutheran theologians, as Kliefoth, (*Theolog. Zeitschrift* III, 381,) Keil, (Commentary on Ezekiel,) and Kurtz, (art. Cherubim in the *Cyclopaedia of Herzog.*) Most of the theologians, on the other hand, and among them even Hengstenberg, (art. Cherubim in *Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, reprinted in the work, *Weissagungen des Propheten Ezechiel,)* regard the Cherubs as sacred symbols, creatures of imagination, to which reality can be ascribed only so far as the idea is concerned which they represent. While Hengstenberg insists that only that view of the Cherubs can be correct which is equally applicable to all passages of the Bible containing the word, Professor Riehm, now one of the editors of the *Studien*, asserts that "Biblical Theology has shown that in the course of historical development even fundamental

conceptions of revealed religion may undergo various modifications, and that with regard to symbolical representations it is still more probable that their shape and meaning have been subject in the course of time to changes and transformations." That the idea of Cherubim has undergone transformations in the course of time he regards as fully established, and only the degree and the significance of these changes remain, in his opinion, subjects of serious discussion. A few years ago Riehm published an elaborate essay on the subject, (*De natura et notione symbolica Cheruborum,*) and a number of prominent theological scholars, as Diestel, Kamphausen, Dillman, and H. Schultz, have more or less declared their agreement with his views, which he undertakes in the above article to set forth again, and to defend against his opponents. His article is, however, confined to "the most ancient original shape of the idea of Cherubs," according to which he finds they were viewed as beings by means of which God in his personal manifestations moved "from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven, as well as upon and over the surface of the earth."

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE, (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Edited by Professor Hilgenfeld. 1871. Third Number.—1. HILGENFELD, The Epistle to the Philippians, examined with regard to the Contents and Origin. 2. HOLTZMANN, Barnabas and John. 3. WERNER, Herder's View of the Old Testament. 4. HILGENFELD, the Psalms of Salomo, translated into German, and again examined. 5. CLEMENS, the Communities of the Essenes. 6. VAN VLOTTEN, Lucas and Silas. 7. HOLTZMANN, The Birth-year of Luther. 8. SPIEGEL, Three Inedited Letters of Melanchthon.

Dr. Clemens, a young theologian who has already published several essays on the Essenes, endeavors to establish in the article on the Essene Communities several controverted points in the history of the celebrated Jewish order. He regards it as probable that the Essenes were not confined to Palestine, but that communities were also found in Syria, and among the Jews of other foreign countries. As regards Palestine, they were, even during the first century of the Christian era, to be found throughout the country, and not only in the rural districts, but also in the cities, and Jerusalem, without doubt, has also had its community. Though hermits, the Essenes appear to have taken a lively interest in national affairs. The number of members in Palestine was about four thousand. The larger portion of the order observed celibacy, but a small branch allowed its members to marry. As regards the Therapeutae of

Egypt, most of the recent writers on the subject, among others Tidemann, (*Het Essenisme*, Leiden, 1863;) Lipsius, (art. *Esse-nen* in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, and Hilgenfeld, (*Die jud. Sibyllen und der Essenismus*), (*Zeitschrift für Wissensch. Theol.* 1871, p. 56,) regard them as an Egyptian branch of the Essenes; but in opposition to them Dr. Clemens adheres to the opinion formerly advanced by him, that the Therapeutæ were an entirely independent order of Jewish ascetics, who are historically entirely unconnected with the Essenes.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Historical Theology.)
Third Number. 1871. 1. KRUMMEL, Ultraquists and Taborites. A Contribution to the History of the Bohemian Reformation in the Fifteenth Century. 2. RONNEKE, Extracts from the Resolutions of the Diocesan Council of Pistoja, 1786. 3. LIMBACH, Tertullian as Source for Christian Archaeology. 4. MICHAELIS, A Letter of Luther.

The larger portion of this number is filled by a continuation of Krummel's interesting article on the Taborites and Ultraquists. (See "Methodist Quarterly Review," April, 1871, page 316.) The full account of the negotiations of the Bohemians with the Council of Basel is of special interest at this time, when the proceedings of the Vatican Council are still fresh in our memory. At no other *Œcumical Council* of the Roman Catholic Church, neither before nor after, did the Bishops go so far in discussing dogmatical questions with the representatives of heretical bodies. And when, after a long civil war and many vicissitudes, the Bohemian Reformers were prevailed upon, in 1436, to declare their reunion with the Catholic Church, concessions were made which the infallible Popes of our days would not be willing to sanction. The representatives of the Bohemian people and the Margravate of Moravia declared in the Act of Submission that they were ready, *with the exception of the communion under both species*, to render obedience to the Church of Rome, the Council, the Pope, their Bishops and priests in every thing; but that this obedience does not include the external ecclesiastical customs and institutions, but only those articles of faith and ecclesiastical regulations which are *founded in the Holy Scriptures*, and in the rightly-construed doctrine of the Church; so that it must not be regarded as a hinderance of peace and unity if many in Bohemia and Moravia were unwilling to adopt the liturgical customs of the universal Church; nor was it to be regarded as

a breach of the peace if several should fail to act in accordance with this compact.

The second article gives extracts from the resolutions adopted by the famous Diocesan Council of Pistoja in Tuscany, held in 1786 by Bishop Ricci. This Synod, which was attended by two hundred and thirty-four priests, took strong ground against the infallibility of the Pope, and in favor of thorough-going reforms; but it was promptly anathematized by the Pope, and finally failed, as all similar reformatory movements in the Roman Church have been failures.

•••

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE. (Christian Review.) No. IX. September 5, 1870.—1. PRESSENSE, Recent Excavations at Rome. The Palace of the Cæsars and the Catacombs. 2. BENJAMIN COUVE, Moral Criticism. 3. REY, Essay on the Death Penalty. 4. RUFFET, Lambert d'Avignon. 5. CHATONET, Refuge, (a Religious Poem.) No. X. October 10.—PRESSENSE, The National Defense. No. XI. November.—1. PRESSENSE, The Situation. 2. ROGER HOLLARD, The 31st October. 3. PRESSENSE, The Question of Municipal Schools in the Department of the Seine. 4. BERSIER, The Good Side of the Siege of Paris. No. XII. December.—1. PRESSENSE, The Situation. 2. H. C. MONOD, The Question of Communal Schools in the Department of the Seine. No. XIII. December.—1. PRESSENSE, The Situation. 2. G. MONOD, Address at the General Prayer-Meeting held in the Temple of the Oratory on December 7. 3. FOLTZ, The Present Position of the Two Armies. 4. PRESSENSE, A Letter to the *Journal des Débats* on the Regeneration of France.

Like all the papers of Paris, the *Revue Chretienne* has passed through a severe ordeal during the last nine months. The siege of Paris by the Germans, as the above table of contents shows, has reduced this able exponent of Protestant principles to a small size, and the rule of the Commune has probably interfered with it still more, for we have received no number since those of December, 1870. The French Protestants, as was to be expected, warmly sympathized during the late war with the fate of their country, in spite of all the efforts made by fanatical priests to arouse popular prejudice against them as the co-religionists of the heretical Prussians. The republican form of government has many warm friends among the leading Protestants of France, and the pages of the above numbers of the *Revue Chretienne* fully prove how earnestly they participated in all the efforts for a liberal and yet lawful regeneration of their country; but their number was too small to show their influence during the late terrible crisis.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE OPPOSITION AGAINST THE VATICAN COUNCIL.—It is a remarkable proof of the marvelous strength of the Roman Catholic hierarchy that the opposition of the Bishops against the new doctrine of Papal Infallibility, which before the promulgation of the decree of the Vatican Council was so outspoken and unexpectedly determined, has now been entirely silenced. They know how to enforce obedience in Rome. Some of the members of the minority may have hoped to be able to escape an open submission by observing a total silence; but this would not satisfy the Pope. Every Bishop has been commanded to announce in an official circular to the whole clergy of his diocese the new doctrine of the Church, and, so far as we know, they now have all, with the only exception of three or four Orientals, obeyed. Great joy has in particular been produced by the submission of Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans, who, fervent in every thing he writes, is said to have delighted the Pope by the unexpectedly submissive tone of his letter of submission; but no Bishop of the whole world was watched with so great anxiety as the learned Bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, in Würtemberg. Having been from the earliest years of his priesthood Professor of Theology at Tübingen, the best Catholic theological school of the world, he has by numerous writings, and in particular by a voluminous history of all the Councils, acquired the reputation of one of the greatest Catholic scholars, and he is in particular looked upon as the most learned of all the Bishops. On this account alone his defection would have been a terrible blow; but not for this reason alone, for the open opposition of any German Bishop would have at once organized the tens of thousands of lay Catholics who already had refused their submission, into an "Old Catholic Church." The Bishop appears to have long hesitated to comply with the orders of Rome, for the ultramontane papers of Germany, and even the ultramontane clergy of his own diocese, began to murmur against the indications of his disobedient spirit, and to suspect him of a heretical leaning. At length the Bishop has been induced to yield, and to issue the commanded pastoral letter to his diocese. An attentive reader need not to know any thing of the past history of the author of this document in order to see at once that it has been extorted from an undecided mind. Its language is that of the dryest judicial notification. It teems with so much learning that many of the less educated priests may have had some difficulty in understanding it at first reading. The main point is dispatched in a few lines, and the real meaning of the doctrine is said to consist in this—that formerly appeals from the decision of the Pope to an Ecumenical Council were regarded as lawful, while by the infallibility decree these appeals are in future inadmissible. It shows the importance which Rome attaches to the submission of this one man that this reluctant and undecided pastoral letter brought to its author at once a highly

recommendatory letter from the Papal Nuncio. Rome is overjoyed that the great ecclesiastical *coup d'etat* has been accomplished without a single Bishop in the wholly Christian countries raising the standard of revolt.

The conduct of the episcopate has probably confirmed the Holy Father and his advisers in the hope that without the leadership of a Bishop a serious rebellion would be impossible in a Church which wholly rests on the apostolical succession of an episcopal hierarchy. This hope, however, has probably been considerably disturbed by the events of the last months. In one country at least there has been a formidable beginning of a crystallized opposition. If the thousands of German Catholics who have made up their minds never to submit to the infallible Pope have not found a leader among their Bishops, they have the great satisfaction to have found as leader Dr. Döllinger, whom Catholic Germany has for nearly half a century revered as one of her greatest literary heroes, who has been the instructor of nearly every living German Bishop, and whom the Bishops, as long back as 1848, when their Church, in consequence of the great revolution of that year, had to undergo an entire reconstruction of her relation to the State, invited to their first national assembly as their theological adviser. Döllinger is now more than seventy years old. He is in the archdiocese of Munich the highest dignitary next to the Archbishop, and at the same time a member of the first Chamber of the Bavarian Parliament. He has always remained unyielding in his opposition to the decree of the Council, and among those who know him, not the least doubt was felt as to the reply he would give to the summons of the Archbishop to submit. His reply, which is dated March 28, is, in point of firmness and learning, fully up to the general expectation. Döllinger offers to prove before the annual meeting of the Bishops at Fulda, or before a committee of learned theologians appointed by the Archbishops, five points, namely: 1. That none of the biblical passages quoted by the Council in support of the new doctrinal decrees were interpreted by any of the Church Fathers in the sense which is now forced upon them. Having twice sworn, as a professor of theology, to accept and to interpret the Holy Scriptures no otherwise than according to the unanimous agreement of the fathers, Döllinger says he would violate his oath if he would accept the new decrees against the testimony of the Fathers. 2. The German Bishops now maintain that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility has been universally, or almost universally, believed in all the centuries of the Church. Döllinger, on the contrary, offers to prove that during the first one thousand years it was entirely unknown, and that it is contradicted by the clearest facts and testimonies. 3. He offers to prove that the Bishops of the Latin countries, Spain, Italy, South America, and France, who formed the large majority of the Bishops in Rome, were misled even as students of theology by theological hand-books, in which the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is set forth after forged documents. He refers in particular to the works of Alfons Liguori and the Roman Jesuit, Perrone. 4. He offers to prove that two Ecumenical Councils and several Popes in the fifteenth century have decided the question of Papal Infallibility, and that their decisions directly

contradict the decree of the Vatican Council. 5. He finally offers to prove that the new decrees are thoroughly irreconcilable with the constitutions of the European States, and in support of this opinion he appeals to the judgment of any law faculty of the German universities. Döllinger next refers to several facts in the past ages of the Church to prove that his proposition is in accordance with the principles and the practice of the Church. He quotes in particular the Conference in 411 between two hundred and eighty-six Catholic and two hundred and seventy-nine Donatistic Bishops, and to the conferences between the Bohemians and the Councils of Constance and Basel. He recounts the efforts which were made by the German Bishops, including the Archbishop of Munich himself, during the Council to prevent the dogmatization of Papal Infallibility when they used to urge the same arguments with which now Döllinger supports his case. He concludes by saying that as a Christian, as a theologian, as a historian, and as a citizen, he cannot accept this doctrine.

The letter produced an extraordinary sensation throughout the Catholic world. The Archbishop at once (April 2) issued a pastoral letter, which was to be read from all the pulpits of the diocese, and soon followed this up by hurling against Döllinger the greater excommunication. As Döllinger in his letter had ventured to doubt whether any of the Catholic clergy really believed the new doctrine, numerous addresses were presented by the lower clergy to the Archbishop of Munich, assuring him of their sincere adhesion to the new doctrine. As the lower clergy are entirely in the hands of the Bishops, but few mustered courage to refuse the signing of the address which was presented to them; but outside of the parochial clergy the movement soon assumed large dimensions. Nearly a dozen professors of theology at the German universities openly sided with Döllinger, though they were, like him, suspended from priestly functions, and from the exercise of their professorial duties. The lay professors of the University of Munich almost unanimously (to the number of forty-four) signed a congratulatory address to Döllinger, thanking him for the bold stand taken, assuring him of their entire sympathy, and encouraging him to go forward. Similar addresses were sent to him by the Catholic lay professors of all the other universities. From the professors the movement extended to the students, who, throughout Germany, were unanimous in their demonstrations of sympathy. Many sympathetic addresses were also received from foreign countries, among which one signed by a large number of the professors of the University of Rome, naturally attracted special attention.

But only in Germany has a step been taken toward a practical organization. In all the large cities societies of "Old Catholics" have been formed, and several itinerant priests have been engaged to visit them and to preach to them. A general assembly of delegates from all parts of Germany is to be held in the course of the summer. The Town Council of Munich has removed from one of the city colleges a religious instructor for avowing his acceptance of the infallibility doctrine, and many Town Councils of Germany and Austria are determined to use all their power

in encouraging the Old Catholic movement against the papal hierarchy; but with all this the "Old Catholic" Church is still in a very embryonic state. It cannot assume definite shape until it has at least found Bishops to govern it, for only an Episcopal Catholic Church, like the Church of England and the Church of the Jansenists in Holland, can expect to rally considerable masses in its support.

A great deal will also depend on the attitude of the governments. If any of the governments—if, in particular, the government of the largest Catholic State, Bavaria—should comply with the wish of the Old Catholics, to regard them as the former Catholic State Church, to forbid the introduction of the doctrine of the Papal Infallibility into the pulpit and into the schools, to fill the episcopal sees and the theological chairs with men who repudiate the doctrine, it may yet be possible to sever the connection of a large portion of Catholic Germany with Rome. In all movements of this kind large masses are ready to follow the winning party, and no one in particular doubts that a large portion of the clergy, if they have to choose between the repudiation of papal infallibility or of their salary, would not hesitate to repudiate the former. In Bavaria a petition to the King to assume this position, and to protect the Old Catholic Church against the encroachments of Popery, received within a few days no less than twelve thousand signatures—a clear proof how important the movement would soon become if the government should be willing to take the desired course. The Committee which has circulated this petition embraces some of the highest officers of the kingdom, some representatives of the oldest nobility, and men who in literature and in politics have been thus far regarded as pillars of the Church. The petition calls the attention of the government to the fact that the Bavarian Bishops, although expressly forbidden by their government, have officially announced the infallibility doctrine, and that the clergy are now using the pulpit, the confessional, and all means within their power, to force this illegal doctrine upon a reluctant population. The petitioners represent that thousands and thousands of Catholic men are afraid of signing this petition, or are even making their submission, because they fear that the priests, by excommunicating them, will disturb their domestic peace, and ruin their business, and they therefore pray the King to put a stop to the lawless encroachments of the party which follows the dictates of Rome, and to head the combat against Italian arrogance and ignorance.

The government of Bavaria has never recognized the Vatican Council, and the King has repeatedly assured Döllinger of his personal sympathy with the course taken by him; but it is feared that he lacks the necessary firmness to play the part which the liberal Catholics of his kingdom, and of the whole world, hope he may play, and which, if successfully played, would secure to him an immortal fame in history. From the other Catholic princes nothing is to be expected. The Emperor of Austria is believed to have given a reluctant consent to the liberal legislation which has of late been introduced into the empire. The present minority is suspected of ultramontane tendencies, and is very reserved in its official expressions.

It has declared, however, in the Reichsrath, that it adheres to the abolition of the Concordat; that it regards the doctrine of infallibility as a Church question which does not concern the State, but that the State government must and will guard its full rights as regards the practical consequences of the doctrine. The party which is at present in the ascendancy in France is wholly under the influences of the Church, and even dreams of a forcible restoration of the temporal power. In Switzerland there is still in some Cantons a strong tendency to take efficient measures against the practical incorporation of the infallibility doctrine into the creed of the Catholic Church; but the Roman party has recently had the great triumph that in the largest Catholic Canton of the Confederation, Lucerne, the government has, by a general election, passed from the hands of the Liberal into those of the Ultramontane party.

Outside of Germany the most notable protests against papal infallibility are those from Father Hyacinthe and the Roman Jesuit Passaglia. The former, in a congratulatory letter, dated Rome, April 26, assures Döllinger that his reply to the Archbishop of Munich has produced an immense impression in Rome. "I hear people speak," he says, "of the approaching dangers of a schism; the schism is already present; it exists to a degree which was hitherto unknown, and, what is most appalling, it has its roots in the very institution which ought to give us unity. Whole libraries might be formed of the books which have been written against the arrogance of the Roman court, and yet this arrogance has constantly increased. Against such a system the demonstrations of science and the protests of conscience are of no avail. The men who represent the system do not understand the language of truth and of justice, or, in their infatuation, they believe themselves to have power over morality and history, and to be able to transform both according to the image of infallibility. To open their eyes it is necessary that they run their heads against events which are stronger than they, and this, if I am not mistaken, will be the terrible chastisement which God has in store for them, and at the same time the un hoped-for salvation which God prepares for his Church." The Jesuit Passaglia, who ten years ago was regarded as one of the chief court theologians of the Pope, has issued a manifesto, in which he designates the promulgation of the doctrine of infallibility as "a wanton encroachment upon the attributes of God."



ART. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The adherents of the late Council are still smarting under the weighty blows which the writings of men like Döllinger, Michelis, Schulte, and many others, have inflicted upon them. It is especially the work of Schulte, to which we referred in the last number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review," which places them in a very unpleasant position; for to

suppress the movement which has begun within the Roman Catholic Church of Germany they need very much the aid and sympathy of the secular governments. These, however, will be little disposed to side with them if they admit the validity of the many proofs brought forward by Schulte, that the Popes claimed by divine right an absolute power over all secular governments. A number of ultramontane writers have already tried to refute the book of Schulte, among them Bishop Fessler, of St. Pölten, the Secretary of the Vatican Council, (*Die wahre und falsche Unfehlbarkeit der Päpste*. Vienna, 1871.) and Dr. Scheeben, Professor in the ecclesiastical Seminary of Cologne, (in the first and second number of the periodical *Das Ökumenische Concil vom Vatican*, for 1871;) but neither of these two writers has a reputation as a ripe scholar, and it will require much abler writers to weaken the impression which has been produced by the work of Schulte.

The "Hand-book of Protestant Polemics against the Roman Catholic Church," (*Handbuch der Protestantischen Polemik*, 3d edition. Leipzig 1871,) by the Church historian, Karl Hase, is regarded in Germany by Protestants of all parties, and even by the Roman Catholics themselves, as one of the ablest Protestant works against the claims of the Roman Catholic Church. The author possesses a knowledge of every thing connected with Roman Catholicism which is rarely found to the same extent among Protestant writers, and which astonishes even the Catholics. The latter, moreover, are unanimous in recognizing a dignity of style, which they pretend generally to miss among their opponents, and of which they themselves most certainly are entirely destitute. The first edition of the "Hand-book" appeared in 1862. The present (third edition) contains a reply to a Catholic opponent, Dr. T. Speil, (*Die Lehren der Kathol. Kirche gegenüber der protest. Polemik*. Freiburg, 1865,) and fully discusses the Vatican Council, the doctrine of Infallibility, and the downfall of the temporal power. The polemics of the Hand-book not only refer to the doctrines of the Catholic Church, but also thoroughly ventilate its influence upon life.

Professor Zöckler, who has won by several writings the reputation of being one of the most learned theologians of the orthodox school, especially in the province of exegesis, has recently published a work on the Augsburg Confession, historically and exegetically examined as doctrinal basis of the Church of the German Reformation, (*Die Augsburgische Confession*. Frankfurt, 1870.) The chief object of the author is to defend the idea of a confederative union of the German Protestant Churches (Lutheran and Reformed) on the basis of the Augsburg Confession in its unaltered form of 1530. The work is generally regarded as one exhibiting great historical research, though its conclusions will be accepted only by Lutherans of the strictest school.

The second edition of Rothe's Theological Ethics (*Theologische Ethik*. Wittenberg. 5 vols.) has just been completed by the publication of the fifth volume. The value of this work, as one of the most prominent theo-

logical publications which Protestant Germany has ever produced, is fully known to every theological scholar.

The work of Professor Gess, of Basel, on the Person and Work of Christ according to Christ's own testimony, and to the testimonies of the apostles, (*Christi Person und Werk*. Basel, 1870,) is an enlargement of a work published by the same author in 1856 on the doctrine of the person of Christ. It will consist of three parts. The first, now published, contains the testimony of Christ himself concerning his person and work, the second will contain the testimony of the apostles, and the third will fully develop the doctrine of the person and work of Christ on the basis of the results obtained in the two former parts. The book is written from an orthodox point of view.

Professor Ewald of Göttingen has added another to his former commentaries on the New Testament by a work on the Seven Epistles, which thus far he had not yet treated, namely, Ephesians, First and Second Peter, Judas, and the three pastoral epistles, (*Sieben Sendschreiben des neuen Bundes*. Göttingen, 1870.) A commentary on the Acts, the only book which has not yet been fully explained by Ewald, will soon follow. After that the author intends to unite all his volumes on the books of the New Testament into one large connected work. The merits of Ewald as one of the greatest Oriental scholars now living are generally acknowledged, but the opinion of the literary world is equally unanimous on the unparalleled vanity of the man, which approaches insanity, and which causes him to attack in turn all theological parties, and to recognize no theological scholarship except his own. The first edition of Peter and that of Judas are regarded by Ewald as authentic; but the Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistles to the Ephesians, to Timothy, and Titus, are, in his opinion, of later origin. In the prefaces to his last volumes Ewald has a great deal to say about Bismarck, the policy of Prussia, and the union movement in Germany, all of which he regards as thoroughly antichristian. Besides the few socialists, Ewald is the only member of the German Parliament who condemns the re establishment of a German Empire.

A new German translation of the Church Fathers, which was begun in 1869, (*Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*. Kempten, 1869-'71,) is steadily advancing. The collection is published under the direction of Professor Reithmayr, of Munich, who has secured the co-operation of a number of Catholic scholars as special editors of the several Fathers. Thus far eighteen volumes have been published, containing the writings of the apostolic Fathers, (complete,) and select writings of Cyprian, Chrysostom, Ephraem the Syrian, Tertullian, Eusebius, Vincentius Lerinensis, and Justinus. The collection will embrace all the prominent writings of the early Church Fathers, both Latin and Greek, and even of the Syrians and other Orientals. Biographical, literary, and other explanatory notes are added to each volume. One volume appears every month.

Darwinism has a large number of adherents among the young scholars of Germany, and it is admitted on all sides that the school is making very

valuable contributions to many branches of literature. A small pamphlet by Professor Preyer, of Jena, on the five senses of men, (*Die fünf Sinne des Menschen*. Leipzig, 1870,) is particularly valuable as a very clear summary of all the latest investigations in the province of physiology, which it explains in numerous notes. The author takes causality to be a function of the brain, and, as a strict Darwinian, believes that this faculty in times long past was acquired, and is now merely inherited. A work by Fr. Koerner on the personal and historical development of the human spirit, (*Der Menschengeist in seiner persönlichen und weltgeschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Leipzig, 1870,) advances views grossly materialistic. He reduces all psychic energies to movements of molecules of nerves and combinations of ganglions.

The Commentary of the late Professor Tuch, of Leipzig, on Genesis, was at its first appearance, thirty-two years ago, regarded as one of the most remarkable exegetical works of German theology. Tuch never published another work of large size, but the work of Genesis alone has secured to him forever an honorary place among prominent theologians. He was the first to distinguish between two writers whom, in his opinion, the author of Genesis had before him, and whom he designated as the "Elohist" and "Jahvist," a distinction which for all subsequent commentators became the chief point of investigation. The work of Tuch appeared to many so important that, notwithstanding the large number of commentaries on the same biblical book which have appeared since, a new edition was called for. It was prepared by Professor Arnold, who, however, died before its recent publication, (*Commentar über die Genesis*. Halle, 1871.) The new edition is replete with stores of learning, and the investigations of Weber, Roth, and Spiegel, on Sanskrit and Zend; of Champollion, Benfey, and Lepsius, on the hieroglyphics; of Lassen, Spiegel, Grotewald, Rich, Ainsworth, and Pictel, on the cuneiform inscriptions and the discovered cylinders, have been fully made use of.

One of the most important contributions to a future history of the Vatican Council is a work in the Latin language by Dr. Friedrich, Professor of Church History at the University of Munich, entitled *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum, anni 1870.* (Munich, 1871.) The author is well known in the literary world by a number of learned works, in particular by a Church History of Germany. At the beginning of the Council he was called to Rome to serve as theological adviser of one of the German Cardinals, Prince Hohenlohe. He soon became disgusted with the proceedings of the Council, and the Ultramontane party suspected him of being one of the parties which furnished to the "Augsburger Zeitung" the famous Roman letters which has since appeared (in English as well as in German) under the pseudonym Quirinus. He has now been excommunicated, together with Dr. Döllinger, and in a long reply to the Archbishop of Munich reviews, with reference to the above-mentioned work, the conduct of the German Bishops at the Council. He makes many important revelations, which, coming as they do from an eye-witness whose veracity

up to the time of his excommunication has been in his own Church beyond suspicion, prove the recent Council to have been an even more despicable farce than has generally been believed. Often, says Dr. Friedrich, the Bishops of the minority, and in particular the Bishop of Augsburg, appealed to history: "It must at a future time sit in judgment over this Council, this inexpressible pressure, and the treatment which this minority had to experience." When Dr. Friedrich, disgusted with what he had seen in Rome, desired in May, 1870, to return home, a Prussian Bishop remarked to him: "You must stay here, for it is necessary that the historians sit in judgment over these perfidious proceedings. An Ecumenical Council is here entirely out of the question. I only wonder that the German Bishops have not yet jumped out of their skin." This same Bishop remarked to him that he had assured an Italian Bishop that in Germany "a meeting of shoemakers was more decent than this Council." Dr. Friedrich says he can prove that, of all the German Bishops, with the exception of one, none had thoroughly studied the question of infallibility before his journey to Rome, and none could or did study it while at Rome. The theologians whom the Bishops had taken along as their advisers were in an equal state of ignorance; the theologian of the Archbishop of Munich, for instance, was unable to find the passage of Ireneus on which so great stress was laid by the Infallibilists, and Dr. Friedrich had to show it to him in a German work where it is quoted. The majority of the Council regarded as one of the best works in favor of infallibility a work by the Italian Bishop Ghilardi, of Mondovi, who was considered one of the most learned Bishops of Italy. One of the German Bishops called this book a real theological humbug. Besides Ghilardi's book, those by Archbishop Cardoni, Archbishop Manning, of Westminster, and Archbishop Deschamps, of Malines, are considered standard works by the Infallibilists. They are as worthless as the book of Ghilardi, and Deschamps in particular is charged by Friedrich with having knowingly falsified quotations in favor of Infallibility. An interesting proof of the dishonesty of the majority of the Council is the fact that between the general congregation of July 18, in which the decree of Infallibility was adopted, and its promulgation on July 18, an important addition ("non autem ex consensu ecclesiae") was inserted without the knowledge of the minority. The Archbishop of Munich arrived at home without knowing any thing of the change, and asked for advice in the matter one of the very men whom he has now excommunicated, Dr. Döllinger. The cowardice of the members of the minority is proved by the interesting fact that they were generally afraid of saying "Non placet" in the presence of the Pope, and that therefore the Archbishop of Munich requested Dr. Friedrich to induce Cardinal Prince Hohenlohe to vote "Non placet," as he hoped the other Bishops would not hesitate to follow if a Cardinal residing in Rome should lead. It is a really amusing incident in the history of this infallibility question, that now the Archbishop has excommunicated for refusing to submit to the doctrine of infallibility the very man whom he wished to employ as agent for preventing the promulgation of the doctrine.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Ten Great Religions: an Essay in Comparative Theology. By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. 12mo. pp. 526. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co.

In our notice of Hardwick's "Christ and the Other Masters" we called attention to the probability that the new and yet incomplete department of Comparative Theology is yet to occupy an important place in our course of sacred study. Skeptics like Dr. Draper have, indeed, predicted that the approaching contact of the various religions of the world would enable them to cancel each other; but the present volume clearly indicates that such a contact would afford new force to the Christian argument, and, doubtless, result in the final predominance of that religion which exhibits the conditions of universality in its system.

Mr. Clarke makes too unqualifiedly the statement that until lately it has been the orthodox method to pass a relentless sentence of damnation upon all without the pale of Christianity. Such was the course of Eusebius, Augustine, Calvin, and the followers of Calvin, uniformly, until a very late day. On the other hand, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, the great Arminian leaders in Holland, the Cambridge divines in England, as Cudworth, Whichcote, John Smith, and others, the Arminian side of the Methodistic movement, as Wesley and Fletcher, have firmly maintained the probable salvation of many a so-called heathen. In our chapter upon "Probational Advantages" we have advocated the same view; and Dr. Cocker, in a volume respectfully noticed and quoted by Mr. Clarke, does but illustrate the Arminian view in reference to the Greek philosophy.

Mr. Clarke's volume is a very valuable contribution to the growing science of Comparative Theology. It is in many respects a step in advance of any thing heretofore published in that department. It is clearly a labor of love, and he has laid under contribution a large mass of reading to furnish the result. His catalogue of books consulted is a valuable guide to the student. The Ten Religions are, besides the Christian, the Chinese, the Egyptian, the Brahman, the Buddhist, the Zoroastrian, the Grecian, the Scandinavian, the Jewish, and the Mohammedan. With the exception of Christianity all these are ethnic, that is, national or race religions; they possess each its excellence and its defect; whereas Christianity possesses in its fullness the excellence of each without the defects, and is, therefore, entitled to absorb and can-

cel them all, as the future universal religion. Besides the value of the work as a historical survey it claims to be both an argument for the truth and a prediction of the final universality of Christianity.

Mr. Clarke nearly ignores, if we have read him correctly, any proper direct supernaturalism in any religion. The whole ten are the proper outgrowth of the mind of man as a constitutionally religious being. Inspiration is but vivid intuition of genuine religious truth. Abraham and Moses and David, and, far above all, Jesus the Christ, possessed the purest and clearest intuition, and have attained for men the most truly absolute religion. The prophets were eminent both in their religious intuitions and their presentiments, so that beyond doubt they did foresee and predict Christianity. Hence, though criticism may freely reject much of the Old Testament as unauthentic or untrue, and even though there be myth and legend in the New, still Christianity does present the fullness of religious truth adequate for human wants and for human good.

All this is a survey of the field from the stand-point of what Dr. McCosh calls, perhaps not happily, the "Boston Theology." Of Mr. Clarke's illustrative circular diagram of the ten religions, forming the elegant frontispiece of his book, "the Hub" should have been put in the center, and the cross, as it is, nowhere. We should suppose St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans struck from his canon. Mr. Clarke's work, therefore, finally assumes the aspect of an ingenious argument for the Hub theology. It says to the nine religions, You see how from our center we are able to flow forth and drown you out; it says to Christianity, You see how easily you can conquer if you accept the Hub. The whole religious world then becomes one great pyramid, crowned with the Hub upon its apex!

Seven Homilies on Ethic Inspiration: or, on the Evidence supplied by the Pagan Religions of both Primeval and Later Guidance, and Inspiration from Heaven. By the Rev. JOSEPH TAYLOR GOODSR, F.R.S.E. Part First of an Apologetic Series, and a Sketch of an Evangelic Preparation. 12mo., pp. 320. London: Williams & Norgate. 1870.

Mr. Goodsir's book would, at first sight, seem to be an intended complement of Mr. Clarke's "Ten Religions." It maintains from an earnest, evangelical stand-point the salvability of many a righteous man without the pale of Christendom. It does not so much contemplate other religions as a preparatory to Christianity, though that view is maintained, as seek to trace historically the supernatural elements, the divine revelations vouchsafed by God,

over and above the biblical, and to other than the chosen people. Of these revelations, primitive and traditional, or scattered through the ages, Mr. Clarke says nothing. Yet what rationalist or scientist has solved for us the undeniable and specific traditions of the Deluge, with their minute traits plainly identical with the Genesis history?

Mr. Goodsir begins with Egypt; and, holding the Septuagint chronology to be the true measure of historic time, he finds in the Great Pyramid clear references to the history of the flood, a plain identification of the time of the event, and manifold traces of a primitive degree of science to which modern ages have but lately attained; a science either communicated by revelation or received from the antediluvian civilization. Mr. Goodsir does not hold the first chapter of Genesis to be intended as a scientific anticipation of modern geology and astronomy; but he maintains that it is written for a religious purpose, yet in a consistency with science such as no other ancient cosmogony presents, such as no purely unscientific and uncivilized fancy could devise. Nay, the whole Old Testament, while using the language of popular optical truth, is nevertheless preserved from statements truly at war with science, (such as laying the earth on a tortoise,) and that this preservation arises from that primitive scientific truth of which the Great Pyramid is a monument. To the peculiarities of the Great Pyramid there are passages in the Old Testament which can be clearly interpreted no otherwise than unequivocal allusions; so that, in his view, the Pyramid is the sacred antithesis to the idolatrous tower of Babel. In the bosom of primitive Egypt, in connection with the Pyramid, there was a body of revealed truth, traditionally brought from the ancient seats at Shinar, parts of which, being retained among the arcana of the priesthood, were learned from them by Pythagoras, Plato, Herodotus, and others. Other parts were selected by Moses as truths to be taught in his system, or rites to be embodied in the institutes of Abraham's race.

From this, the Egyptian starting-point, we may range over other nations. Nearer to the primitive abodes, the Shemite portion of Persia retained a grand unidolatrous Theism, the Edenic revelation of a future Redeemer, a distinctive if a more varying angelology, and even a clearer anticipation of a future judgment than Moses unfolded in the letter of the law. Passing to Greece and Rome, we have abundant traces of primitive truth. First, in the mythology of both countries, besides the detailed fragments of the

diluvian tradition, there are numerous myths which it is useless to deny to be relics of primitive truth brought from the ancestral seats in Asia. It is wonderful how writers like Mr. Clarke skip over the true significance of the ancient oracles, scattered as they were at memorable points in Egypt, Greece, and Italy, revered by the wisest statesmen and philosophers, and recorded by the best historians of antiquity, Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus, as furnishing predictions beyond all question verified. Then in Greece the mysteries of Eleusis were the depositaries of supernatural truths, and the sibylline books are well attested to have been derived from the earliest ages, deposited in the capitol, and revered by the highest minds of Rome as possessing supernatural predictions of the future, and a higher, holier order of truth than belonged to the vulgar mythology.

Historically and theoretically we believe Mr. Goodsir's to be the true view. We believe with Mr. Clarke in the intuitional nature of man; but we do not believe in the chilly and twilight space never to be overpassed, which he interposes between God and man. Mr. O. B. Frothingham pronounces miracles as being a violation of nature's laws—"a monstrosity." But we believe that a God fettered and bandaged by nature's laws, laws of his own imposing, is *the* "monstrosity." Material nature is not the god of God. If it be, then to matter itself is our worship due, if to any thing, and idolatry, fetichism, is the true religion. Worse, if worse can be, is Pantheism. Dr. Hedge is reported as saying in Boston: "The popular Theism supposes a God existing outside of the universe which he has made—a Creator who once in time called a universe into being, and has been ever since a spectator and director of its on goings, having no substantial connection with it, but only a providential and governmental one. The God of Pantheism is immanent, interfused, all-penetrating; the ground of all dependence, the life of all life."

Now Theism, "the popular theism," the theism of the Bible and of the great body of Christian thought, teaches the omnipresence and the perfect immanence of God—God "all in all." It does believe that God is also "outside" of matter; for as matter is finite and God infinite, God does stretch infinitely beyond the limits of matter as the ocean stretches immensely beyond the little islet it embosoms. What truth or propriety is there in Dr. Hedge's thus denying that our Theism teaches the all-pervading, indwelling presence of God in nature? Pantheism teaches, as Theism does, not only God's immanence in matter, but it teaches,

as Theism does not, God's *identity with matter*. Largely the God of Pantheism is made of oxygen gas. The difference between Theism and Pantheism is this: Theism teaches the immanence of God in matter and the immanence of matter in God, yet the infinite distinctness in essence between matter and God, and the infinite omnipresence of God "without" and beyond the limits of matter. Pantheism teaches the identity of substance, both bodily and spiritual, of God with that of every finite object, whether inanimate, as a rock, or animate, as a cat. Both Mr. Clarke and Mr. Goodsir agree with Max Müller that the primitive creed was Theism. Hence men first apostatized, as in Egypt, to Pantheism, and thence, by strict logical sequence, to fetishism. Rigidly and rightly inferring from her premises that every animal was a manifestation and a part of God, Egypt believed that the animal is to be worshiped. Certainly it is absolutely impossible for a Pantheist to worship his entire god without *including* in that worship swamps, rocks, cats, dogs, crocodiles, murderers, and prostitutes. Corporeally and spiritually the prostitute is the Pantheist's god. And it is by this route that the great share of licentious idolatry in Egypt, Babylon, and various parts of the world, was attained. Against all these logical and historical results Christianity protests; and by her pure theism she is able to maintain that sublime ideal of absolute holiness which every other religion obscuring lets the human race down into sin and death. Maintaining the infinite distinctness of God from matter, she separates God from all community with the sins of the flesh; maintaining the distinctness of God from the finite free-agent, she separates Him from all the sins of the spirit and the will. She enthrones him as the omnipresent God, the absolutely holy God, before whom can be no allowance for sin.

American Religion. By JOHN WEISS. 12mo, pp. 326. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1871.

Mr. Weiss is, we believe, the biographer of Theodore Parker, whom he entombed in two huge octavo volumes, covered with multitudinous flowers of a very forced and tawdry rhetoric. He is a prominent member also of the Boston Radical Club, a coterie that periodically gushes forth in streams of thin and watery twaddle, overflowing into the columns of certain sympathizing newspapers. Mr. Weiss is a weak and scattered thinker, who attains notoriety only by attacking settled opinions. A log floating down a stream is a very quiet wooden thing; but let it stick fast, become a snag

and oppose the current, and it "makes a noise in the world;" a "noise" quite as valuable as any Mr. Weiss can make.

Mr. Weiss talks of getting up an "American Religion," as if that kind of article were capable of being manufactured. But he may be assured that his whole attainment will be, if any thing, not construction but destruction. He may communicate to others his own chaotic mental state. He may under pretense of religion vacate some men's minds of all the religion they have; but it will be as easy for him to breathe vitality into the marble image of death, as to create his new religion, in a positive vitalizing form, in their vacant souls. Men may be glad to be disburdened of the ancient checks upon the conscience; but, so vacated, their artificial substitute will be but the brief prelude to an eternal emptiness.

The pocket is often the test of the heart. A man's value of his religion may be measurably estimated by the money he will pay in its behalf. And how the professors of this new religion value their article may thus be estimated. A writer in the "National Standard," signing himself NORTH, not long since, after noticing the disbanding of two deistical churches, who were able but unwilling to support their eloquent and faithful preachers, gives us the following account of the great souls of Theodore Parker's former Church:

The class of religious ideas here referred to was first preached in Boston by Theodore Parker. That many people were willing to give a fair hearing to these ideas, and, having heard, that they found them better worth hearing than the diverse doctrines of many kinds elsewhere preached, was shown by the throng which crowded the Melodeon, and, after the Music Hall was built, filled that largest hall in Boston as long as Mr. Parker lived to preach there. The "Twenty-eighth Congregational Society of Boston," which he founded, still exists, though in greatly diminished numbers, continues its meetings, and maintains its minister; but, through the twenty-five years of existence of that Society, the expense of maintaining it has been supplied by a comparatively small portion of the mass of hearers. During the first ten years of Mr. Parker's ministry these expenses were probably more equally distributed, and the resources gained from a larger number of persons than they have ever been since, owing to the zeal, the eminent financial abilities, the social qualities, and the magnetic influence of the late John R. Manley, who during those years held the post of treasurer. Ever since his time the managers of the financial affairs of this Society have found constant difficulty in raising the needful funds, the bulk of which still comes from the disproportionately large contributions of a few persons.

It is noticeable, also, that this Society have done very little missionary or propagandist work, a fact the more remarkable, since their heathen, the people who need the truths they can teach, are at their very doors, abounding in Massachusetts, even in Boston, instead of being far distant in Asia and Africa. If we judge these religious radicals "by their fruits," (and no better way of judging has yet appeared,) they must be thought not to set a great value on the ideas of religion which Mr. Parker taught them. Certainly they are not willing to pay for the diffusion of these ideas among other people. The devotees of the popular faith may mix much superstition with their devotion, but they give this unquestionable proof of prizes their religious system, that they not only pay what is needful for its effi-

cient maintenance at home, but give largely every year to diffuse that system among their unbelieving neighbors, and to send missionaries all over the world to carry it to Jews, Mussulmans, and heathen. Perhaps their notions are not well founded; but they believe those notions, find them worth paying for, feel sure that their acceptance will help their fellow-men every-where, and prove all this by their works.

A few years ago, by the enterprise of one man, a publication was started in Boston intended for the advocacy of such ideas as Mr. Parker taught, and bearing on its title-page, "The Radical; a Monthly Magazine, devoted to Religion." Its founder was rich only in faith, but he was not of the class I have been criticising, for he put all his small worldly possessions, as well as his assiduous labors, into this monthly magazine. It was established in 1865, and was discontinued after the June number of the present year. True, Mr. Morse, being rich in faith, hopes to resume it in January next, but its resumption and continuance can come only by the friends of its idea doing what they have not done for these five years, and what they did not do in the special time of need in June last, when the discontinuance for want of funds was announced, namely, sending money enough to enable the editor to *live* as well as to publish. It is believed that many hold the ideas taught by "The Radical," but the great majority of them do not give either money or labor for its support.

Again, an Association was formed three years ago, in the interest of these same ideas, called "The Free Religious Association." It has just published its third Annual Report, a highly instructive and valuable document, and would willingly do much more had it the means. But the means are not furnished to the able Executive Committee of this body, any more than they were to the editor of "The Radical." It seems true, discreditable as it is to the people who hold these ideas, that they are not willing to *give* to diffuse them. Mr. Parker's influence was great and good beyond the power of moderate speech to express, but that influence seems not to have reached the point of inspiring the majority of his converts to give such things as they have—the poor, labor; the prosperous, labor and money also—for the enlightenment of their fellow-men.

And these are the founders of a new religion! And these truly "*liberal Christians*" are to reform and save the country and the age! No, Mr. Weiss, we Methodists, with our outpouring hundreds of thousands, building churches and schools, sending the blessed old Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ through the land and through the earth, laugh you and all your tribe to scorn. For we are a reality and you are a sham.

Culture and Religion in some of their Relations. By J. C. SHARP, Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews. 12mo., pp. 197. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1871.

Culture has for some time been a watch-word and battle-word in England. Three theories are placed by the leaders of thought before the public mind—the scientific, the esthetic, and the religious. Mr. Huxley propounds the scientific theory. It says: Life is a chess-game; learn the laws and win. From science get a strong body, obedient to the will, and all obedient to conscience. *Culture*, from the pen of Matthew Arnold, says: Be a finished literary gentleman, with religion of a quantity sufficiently small

to escape spoiling your graceful tastes and manners. And now Professor Shairp says: First realize your true relations to God, and culture, both scientific and esthetic, will come in subordinately to this.

Professor Shairp's book is written in a style of very graceful amenity, deriving its power not from terse sentences or strong words, but from the transparency in which the truth is made to stand out before the mind, and the momentous value of the truth itself. There is a tranquilizing and purifying power in his words, well intended to reach the conscience and awaken the mind of the age to reflection. Especially powerful it is in its wonderfully clear exposure of the sordid style of the Huxleyan culture.

We were struck with the closing paragraph of a very truthful analysis of the discussion in the "Nation." Before quoting the paragraph we will present a preparatory thought or two. All sin may be divided into sins of the spirit and sins of the flesh. The latter are the indulgences of the lower elements of our nature, the appetites, and tend to brutalism. The former are the misuse of our higher faculties, our intellect and taste, and tend to diabolism. The sins of the spirit are often the worse of the two, consisting often in those fabrications of falsehood by which thousands of souls are deceived into sin and death. The *Nation's* paragraph portrays vividly, though excusingly, the sin of the spirit; and we place beside it a parallel portraiture of the sin of the flesh.

SIN OF THE SPIRIT.

"There is an enormous class of minds for which Mr. Shairp's system really makes no provision—minds which are prevented by their very constitution from wandering on the dimly-lighted border-land which men of a saintlier or more mystic turn so dearly love, who must see clearly or not at all, and must apprehend through the intellect or remain totally ignorant. It is useless to tell them that they can if they will. They have been hearing this for two thousand years, and are no nearer spiritual culture, as Mr. Shairp describes it, than ever. Nay, they are daily going off in larger and larger numbers, and framing theories of culture and duty adapted to their special needs, but which, whatever their scientific claims to attention may be, there is no denying have as yet done little to supply any solid rule of conduct, or give as yet but little sign of shedding on the latter stages of the way appointed for all living the tender radiance of the older beliefs."—*Nation*.

SIN OF THE FLESH.

There is an enormous class of appetites for which John B. Gough's lecturing really makes no provision—gullets which are prevented by their very greediness from staggering on to the dizzily seen sober-land where men of a more aqueous or more temperate stomach so safely stay, who must drink brandy or nothing at all, and must find cold water agreeable to the appetite or remain total drunkards. It is useless to tell them that they can stop drunkenness if they will. They have been hearing this for . . . years, and are no farther from spirituous liquors, as Gough describes them, than ever. Nay, they are daily going off in larger and larger numbers, framing new drinks adapted to their special thirsts, but which, whatever the ingenuity of the mixture may be, have done little but deepen their drunkenness and insure their death and damnation.

However true Professor Shairp's or Mr. Gough's lectures may be, they of course are of "no use" to those who "will" repudiate them, and who are "going off in larger numbers" to their own ruin. For such "numbers," it is true, their "system really makes no provision." But it is of some "use" to present truth to men who "can if they will," so long as any of them "will." But truth never claims to nullify the "will" of free-agents who choose to reject it. Nor will the plea of "special needs" any more avail the intellect of the willful infidel than it will the gullet of the willful drunkard. For neither class will the laws of God or the laws of nature be reversed. "He that is wise is wise for himself; but he that scorneth, he alone shall bear it."

Christianity and Positivism: A Series of Lectures to the Times on Natural Theology and Apologetics. Delivered in New York January 16 to March 20, 1871, on the Ely Foundation of the Union Theological Seminary. By JAMES MCCOSH, D. D., LL.D., President of the College of New Jersey, Princeton. 12mo., pp. 369. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.

Dr. M'Cosh has evidently intended to produce not a standard work for students who have already mastered his topic, but a popular book for those who know very little about it. To the attentive and continuous reader of our Quarterly his volume would have the value only of a reminder; for all of value it contains (except the biblical part) has been said in our Quarterly, and, as we in our profound humility think, a great deal better said. The doctor's style shows somewhat ponderously; and yet it possesses no little power to interest and draw the reader in his wake. As a book for the times, for the ordinary reader, it has not a little value, and we wish it a broad circulation. It will serve as a timely check upon the multitude that imagines that scientific skepticism is carrying all before it.

We could have wished that he had covered less field and plowed more deeply. We should have gladly studied something as profound as we give Dr. M'Cosh credit for ability to produce. The first of the three parts his book embraces was ample territory enough for him to occupy. The second might well be embraced, but the third has but distant relation to Positivism, and might have better been postponed to a separate course of Lectures. A train of Lectures suited to the present day, as Cardinal Wiseman's course on Science and Religion suited the day of their delivery, would be a God's-boon. The comparison suggests that Dr. M'Cosh has not devoted sufficient time and labor upon the work to supply the want of the hour.

The book, as already intimated, is divided into three parts, the physical, the metaphysical, and the biblical. In the physical he runs over the doctrine of design, of correlation of forces, and of Huxleyan protoplasm, all of which are discussed much more deeply in our pages than in his. One valuable thread of thought, however, runs through this part, which is to be found, so far as we know, only in his pages. Dr. M'Cosh clearly lays down and illustrates the principle that to discover an immediate efficient cause for a phenomenon does not remove the still recurring demand for a final cause. It only pushes the inquiry farther back. The answer to the *How* never is the answer to the *Why*. In part second Dr. M'Cosh wheels up his intuitionist philosophy, the philosophy of *knowing*, to meet and vanquish Hamilton, Mansel, and Spencer's philosophy of *nescience*. Here Dr. M'Cosh is great in his own great stronghold. Neither Spencer nor Mill are here able to stand before him. We tolerate his putting on the port of a giant, for he has displayed the giant's strength. A large share of the philosophical value of the book lies in the Appendix, wherein the doctor, with a sharp stick, picks numerous holes and gaps and cracks in the Theory of Development, in Darwin's Descent of Man, and in Spencer's Philosophy. His pick-ax finds out certain very shaky spots with a very damaging effect. The biblical part in which, against Renan, he maintains the historical validity of the gospel and apostolic narratives, is excellent in its way. The entire volume, for all interested in the subject, contrives to be decidedly readable.

The Problem of Evil. Translated from the French of M. Ernest Naville, author of "La Vie Eternelle," "Le Père Céleste." By JOHN P. LACROIX, Professor in the Ohio Wesleyan University, and Translator of Pressensé's "Reign of Terror." (The only authorized translation.) 12mo., pp. 330. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

Of this beautiful work a translation was issued by the Clares of Edinburgh, which is repudiated by the author Naville himself. Professor Lacroix's translation *alone is authorized by him*, both by private letter and by a preface furnished to this volume from his own pen.

We regret to say that two notes have accidentally appeared in the published volume signed D. D. W. These were simply the editor's hasty pencilings, without signature, in the rapid examination of the manuscript, and were not intended for the types. We had supposed they were removed in the proof, and were surprised to find them finally in print. They will be expunged from future editions.

Delivered as lectures to large and delighted audiences, these pages are popular as well as profound. "The problem" is unfolded in the most transparent language. Never, probably, has "theodicy" appeared in more clear and attractive array. On nearly every point the doctrines are those that our Church maintains, and the heart of our people rejoices to accept. There are few of our thoughtful laymen who would not find these pages easy, instructive, and attractive reading. Nothing better or truer of the book can be said than the following words of the *Southern Christian Advocate*: "M. Naville is a professor of an institution in Geneva, and we have here a series of lectures delivered by him on a theme which has engaged the thought of the religious and philosophic world for ages. We think this treatise the most rational we have ever read on this subject. His stand-point is that of human freedom, and from it he argues the inevitability of temptation, and consequent peccability of the free agent, and, in the case of mankind, the general involvement in the evil result, growing out of the solidarity of the race. Each man has his special responsibility; but, nevertheless, as one of a race which itself is one, however composed of individuals, the consequences of his act pass even to others, yet not so as to necessarily involve them in compulsory transgression. The work ought to be in every thinker's library."

Fifty Catholic Tracts on Various Subjects. First Series. 12mo. New York: The Catholic Publication Society.

When we receive a Romanist book proposing to convert us to the peculiarities of its faith, we feel very much as we did when a slaveholder proposed to convince us of the rightful supremacy of slavery; that is, we seem to be *argued* with because our opponent has not the power to martyr us. The slaveholder sought to convince us just when he could not lynch us; the priest offers to reason with us just because he cannot burn us. The fact that force is ready to be applied in behalf of a dogma does not indeed disprove the dogma. Persecution *may be* exercised in behalf of the truth; and yet when a man, like the American Romanist, puts a tract into my hands without being able to deny that it is only the want of power that prevents his Church from treating my unbelief with a fagot, I am not readily put into a state of prepossession in his favor. I ask *very strong proofs* before I admit that he, or his Church, or his Pope, has authority to declare my faith for me, to be accepted under alternative of bodily penalty here and eternal damnation hereafter. It will not be two or three metaphorical

expressions, capable of two or three interpretations, of Christ to St. Peter, or some pre-eminence of Peter among the apostles, or some slight expressions of the early Fathers about the pre-eminence of the Roman See, that will arm the present Italian Prelate with such authority over my faith. Those expressions of Christ are strained by Popery beyond all decency of interpretation. Peter was the most eminent *among* the twelve, but he possessed no authority *over* the twelve. The episcopate of Rome was eminent, indeed, as being the episcopate of the imperial city; but there is no valid proof that Peter was ever their Bishop, and so no proof that the Popes derive any authority from him. Every chain is weak as its weakest link, but here every link is weak and worthless.

These tracts are plausibly and ably written. None of them treat specifically upon Christian morality or pure piety upon the broad basis of Christianity. They all invite Romeward; and whoever desires to see how the papal cause is now favorably presented, or feels predisposed to listen to the Romeward invitation, will find a still small insinuating voice in the Fifty Tracts.

Perseverance and Apostasy: Being an Argument in Proof of the Arminian Doctrine on that Subject. By Rev. ALBERT NASH, author of "Prize Essay on Unconditional Perseverance." 12mo., pp. 388. New York: N. Tibbals & Son. 1871.

Mr. Nash has once for all elaborated one of the five points of difference between Calvinism and Arminianism, that is, between fatalism and freedom, with a thoroughness and a finish as no one ever has before him and no one will ever need after him. With a *perseverance* and a penetrativeness fully adequate to the subject, he has furnished a *standard* which will permanently *stand*. He is no rhetorician. No fancy flashes illumine his pages. No melody enlivens his periods. But he thoroughly ransacks and riddles and demolishes all that Edwards, and Dwight, and Williston can say for their dogma, and then builds a counter affirmative argument that none of their successors will ever be able to disturb. He may be consulted with confidence by all who are interested upon the subject. His volume is not a mere ephemeron; it should take its permanent place in the Arminian theological library.

Visions of the Vale; or, Divine Government Among Men. By Rev. B. F. PRICE, of Wilmington Conference. 18mo., pp. 304. New York: Published for the Author by Carlton & Lanahan.

This little volume furnishes twenty-two brief essays, somewhat in an order of systematic thought, upon a series of interesting theological topics. God, Man, Ethics of the Cross, The Law of Providence, Casuistry of Providence, Divine Visitations, Premonitions,

Divine Sovereignty, The Law of Affinities, The Higher Law, The Church, The Millennium, are among the titles of his chapters.

Mr. Price is an evangelical Arminian theologian, an independent and individualistic, but not erratic, thinker; a lucid, consecutive, and suggestive writer. His volume makes no proud pretensions, but thoughtful Christian readers will scarce fail to find sources of interest and profit in his pages.

A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical. With Special Reference to Ministers and Students. By JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D., in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German. Revised, Enlarged, and Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., assisted by American Scholars of various Evangelical Denominations. Vol. XIII of the Old Testament, containing Jeremiah and Lamentations. 8vo., pp 446. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Theologically and Homiletically Expounded. By Dr. C. W. EDWARD NAEGELSBACH, Pastor in Bayreuth, Bavaria. Translated, Enlarged, and Edited by SAMUEL RALPH ASBURY, Rector of Trinity Church, Moorestown, N. J. 8vo, pp. 196. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

We duly chronicle the appearance of this volume as part of Lange's great work. As progress is made in the Old Testament over ground of late very much untrodden, the interest and the value of the work increase. Jeremiah is one of those books for which we need a great commentator. The interest of the volume will not be diminished by the fact that Dr. Naegelsbach rejects Jeremiah's authorship of Lamentations, and furnishes us an elaborate dissertation in disproof. This dissertation is very properly followed by a counter essay in affirmative proof, which strikes us as a very admirable specimen in its class, by Dr. Hornblower.

Congregationalism: What it is; Whence it is; How it works; Why it is Better than any other Form of Church Government; and its Consequent Demands. By HENRY M. DEXTER. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 12mo., pp. 394. Boston: Noyes, Holmes, & Co. 1871.

We suppose this work, being from an eminent master of the subject, is to be accepted as a standard. It claims to ground Congregationalism in the New Testament, to explain how the Churches are formed and managed under its system, to furnish proofs of its superiority over all other forms, and to incite Congregationalists to give it a zealous support. It is learned and able, exhibiting the earnestness of a sincere advocate with none of the fierceness of a bigot. We have no war with that system. We cheerfully acknowledge the deep piety and great active benevolence of the brethren who worship God under its forms. Yet while a Henry Ward Beecher can say, "The Methodists build three churches to our one," we are not yet inclined to adopt it.

Orthodox Congregationalism and the Sects. By Rev. DORUS CLARKE, D.D. 12mo., pp. 169. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.

Dr. Clarke is a sharp thinker and a piquant writer; but we cannot say that he has furnished a deeply Christian book. Among "the sects" he passes Methodism in review, and the style is remarkable for its semi-political tone. You would imagine that Methodism was gotten up by an arch-Jesuit, with "more skill as an ecclesiastical organizer than Hildebrand himself." The system is constructed "adroitly," "enthroned in the chair of the Bishops," abounds in "contrivance," works "dexterously," etc., etc. The entire tone is that Methodism is a clever trick, and Congregationalism ought to be a trick worth two of it.

The Service of Song. A Treatise on Singing in Private Devotion, in the Family and in the School, and in the Worshiping Congregation. By Rev. A. G. STACEY, A.M. 12mo, pp. 340. St. Louis: South-western Book and Publishing Company. 1871.

The special aim of Mr. Stacey's volume is to recall the Church to her ancient melody, to revive the day when Methodism was truly a singing bird. To this end he has furnished a book written in graceful style, full of entertaining anecdote, and well calculated to awaken attention to the subject. We indorse his doctrine very earnestly. The choir should be but the leader, the congregation should be the real choir. The ministry should take the lead in the restoration of the ancient order, and Mr. Stacey's book is for them an admirable stimulant to duty.

The Times of Daniel. An Argument. By HENRY W. TAYLOR, LL.D., late a Justice of the Supreme Court, and Judge of the Court of Appeals of New York. 18mo., pp. 208. New York: Aunson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1871.

Mr. Taylor's argument maintains that the coming of Christ to close the present dispensation will take place in the year 1942, to be succeeded by the millennial corporeal reign of Christ on earth. He assumes the year-day theory, and fixes his dates by a connected synchronism of Daniel and John.

Treatise on Regeneration. By WILLIAM ANDERSON, LL.D., Glasgow. Second Edition. 12mo., pp. 311. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. 1871.

The Atonement: In its Relations to the Covenant, the Priesthood, the Intercession of Our Lord. By Rev. HUGH MARTIN, M.A., Member of the Mathematical Society of London. 12mo., pp. 288. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. 1871.

These two volumes come to us in uniform neat black coat, and look like a twin pair of Presbyterian ministers. They teach the stern old Calvinism of Scotland, partial Atonement, and unconditional Regeneration. Their style is glowing, ultra-evangelical

and, in a way, eloquent. They evince that in this afternoon of the nineteenth century men of refined culture and eminent talent can persist in maintaining the relentless ancient dogmas of Scotia.

The Religion of the Present and of the Future. Sermons preached chiefly at Yale College. By THEODORE WOLSEY. Pp. 402. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

Dr. Wolsey is a thinker for thinkers. He has a position, not popular, but higher than popularity. His mind moves so noiselessly, so patiently, and so deeply, that it is the fit audience, though few, that waits and listens to its utterances, and gathers the wisdom they freight.

Among the topics discussed are the Early Years of Christ, the Temptation of Christ, the Self-propagating Power of Sin, Sin Unnatural, the Religion of the Future.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Welche Wege führen nach Rom? Geschichtliche Beleuchtung der römischen Illusionen über die Erfolge der Propaganda. (Which Ways lead to Rome? Historical Elucidation of the Romish Illusions on the Successes of Propagandism.) Von FRIEDRICH NIPPOLD. 8vo, pp. xviii, 456. Heidelberg: F. Bassermann. 1869.

Dr. Nippold dedicates his work to our ambassador to the Court of Berlin, Mr. Bancroft, and in doing so pays some very high compliments to our countryman. He says that Mr. Bancroft is a master of historical science, and, while Germany has some sons who approach him, she has none who surpass him; he is the worthy representative of American historiography, while Irving, Prescott, and Motley, whose writings are appreciated in all civilized countries, are pre-eminently valued in Germany.

The author of the present work is a well-known member of the free-thinking German Protestant Association, and has already made some of the most important contributions to its young but rapidly increasing literature. In the present case he attempts to kill two birds with one stone; namely, Evangelical Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. Going back into the last century, he traces the whole chain of personal perversions to Romanism, down to the present Vatican Council; and, while showing that Romanism could in no case afford what the neophytes wished, Protestantism was so illiberal and untrue to its previous history as to make them uncomfortable within its fold, and hence made their going elsewhere an absolute necessity. The main point is: Protestantism must throw off its confessional shackles if it would retain its independent thinkers. But the very history of these perverts, as

given by this author, proves that they misconceived Protestantism; that their own statements in self-justification abound in misapprehensions; and that their becoming Catholics was the direct result of their attributing to the Protestant Church and Protestant theology a narrowness which was purely adventitious, and had characterized some of its less prominent representatives. Protestantism itself is not to be charged with the errors of those who belie it; moreover, granted that Protestantism is illiberal, that it restrains where it ought not, what is gained by going over to Romanism, whose whole history is colored by its bigotry?

If from Dr. Nippold's work we eliminate the point he attempts to make, he has done excellent service in the present volume. His work considered alone as a history is really valuable, and as such it is a most important contribution to the later history of the Church.

The Introduction is a reply to the Pope's appeal, when convoking the Vatican Council, to the Protestants to return for peace and salvation to the good mother Rome. We then have, in the body of the book, the perverts to Romanism grouped into classes. Part I. The General Principles of the Conversions. Part II. The Single Ways to Rome. (1.) The aristocratic perverts: Stolberg, Dukes Frederick of Gotha and Ferdinand of Cöthen; other German princes, Swiss patricians, and Dutch and Danish noblemen and scholars. Female perverts: Countess Hahn-Hahn; many other noble ladies, such as Baroness Radowitz, Scheel, and Wetterkopp. (2.) The Romantic School: Schlegel, Tieck, Werner, and later poets and poetesses. (3.) The Romanizing schools of art: Overbeck, Schadon, Vogel, etc. (4.) Restorative Jurisprudence: Adam Müller, Haller, Jarcke, etc. (5.) Returning tendencies among teachers, officials, and publicists: Gfrörer, Eisenbach, Zander, Stub, and others. (6.) Modern orthodoxy: (a) Perverts before 1848; (b) Perverts after 1848. Part III. Conclusions.

Many of the most zealous Roman Catholics now living were once Protestants, and some of them occupied posts of high honor in the Church they have abandoned. Dr. Nippold thinks that the most violent of the extreme Catholics are perverts, and that the most delicate and severe work of propagandism is committed to these very men. As they have traveled the road and been misled, they are, of course, the most fitted to mislead others. Since 1814 European Catholicism has become tenfold more violent and bitter in its hostility to Protestantism than before. The peaceful elements have entirely disappeared, and largely because of the great admixture of perverts. This we know to be the

case of England, and are not surprised to learn that Germany is no exception. The cathedral chapters of Mayence and Freiburg number among their most unrelenting foes to Protestantism men who have but lately left it. The founder and editor of the Munich "People's Messenger" is the pervert Zander. A number of the editors of the "Zion" were but lately Protestants. Von Horen-court has even controlled, as editor, a number of ultramontane journals. Among the presidents and speakers of the popular Catholic gatherings many faces are seen which were equally prominent in Protestantism. The name of Achenbach stood first among the organizers of the Dusseldorf Catholic Assembly. Kehler figured very prominently as a defender of the Moabite Cloister intrigue. Baumstark, immediately after his somersault, appeared as one of the Baden leaders of the Anti-Prussian party. Such men's houses become the strongholds of Jesuitical proselytism. The influences emanating from the homes of Schlosser, Pilat, Tieck, and Veit are confined to no land or language. Many of these converts are wealthy men, and their wealth is at once turned into a propagandist agency.

Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhangend untersucht. (The New Testament Scriptures connectedly investigated. Commentaries on Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Thessalonians.) Von Dr. J. Chr. K. von Hofmann. 6 vols. 8vo., pp. 368, 633, 242, 431, 365, 291. C. H. Beck, Nördlingen. 1863-1870.

A great undertaking, almost comparable to that of Lange or Meyer, and yet totally different in plan from theirs. The author's method is historical, his object being, in and with his exposition, to show the historical basis underlying the whole New Testament. This requires that he should treat the Epistles, not as they stand in every case, but in strictly chronological order. The real meaning of the Scriptures can only be attained by knowing their exact historical substratum; this ascertained, the doctrinal meaning and force can be acquired with comparative ease. History serves a higher purpose in the study of God's word than mere grammar. The Scriptures are not isolations, mere fragments, but one vast organism; and they can only be investigated aright when the individual books are contemplated in their relation to the entire Bible. The history of the origin of the New Testament canon must be compared with its peculiar and collective contents in order to see how it has come to pass, historically, that the several books have been brought into unity, such as we find the New Testament to be. It is only when the connection of the books becomes clear, as well from their internal relation as from the

history of their combination into a canon, that the collective character of the Bible can be known, and what has been the nature of the operation of the Holy Spirit by which the great revelation has been made. Having reached this stage, the relation of the New Testament to the Old becomes apparent, as well as the grounds by which the Church has been justified in combining them and calling them the "Holy Scriptures."

How orthodox Dr. Hofmann's general treatment is, and how inflexible he is particularly on the doctrine of inspiration, may be seen from his own statement of the points he hopes to gain at the conclusion of his work; namely, a proof of the inspiration of the New Testament as a whole. This is not a general inspiration, but a positive and definite one, conforming to the purpose of the Divine mind in imparting it. Neither the inspiration nor the canonicity of any part of this scriptural whole is dependent on the official position or apostolicity of the author, but on the known relation of the scriptural part to the whole. And lastly, the authenticity of any scriptural book is not dependent upon external grounds alone, but also upon the place which it occupies in relation to the organic body of which it is a part. Every thing we find in the New Testament Scriptures concerning Christ rests on the fact of his miraculous departure from God into the world, and has for its object the fact of his miraculous departure from the world to God. All that the New Testament teaches the Church of the present day proceeds from the certainty of Christ's supernatural presence with God, on the one hand, and the certainty of his second revelation into the world on the other—at which second coming he will deliver his people.

The large place which Dr. Hofmann allots to historical treatment gives him ample opportunity, as will be seen at a glance, to take cognizance of all the later schools of doubt. The Tübingen school, for example, has to be dealt with at almost every step of the way. Our leading English commentators are not altogether left out in the cold, which is the treatment generally meted them by German authors. The work, taken as a whole, is the most elaborate attempt yet made to found and apply a philosophy of exegesis. What will be the result we cannot tell before the conclusion; at any rate, the installments thus far issued justify our sanguine expectations, and add another to the goodly catalogue of marvels of the literary daring of these German writers. They are always startling us by their mammoth undertakings, and they are too often successful to make us look with much misgiving on their greatest enterprises.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Genesis of Species. By ST. GEORGE MIVART, F.R.S. With numerous Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 296. London: Macmillan & Co. 1871.

Though natural selection might account for the separation of animal forms into distinct and widely different species, it could not properly claim to account for the existence or origination of the animals themselves which compose the species. It assumed that animals would, if the world were a perfectly genial world, grow up in an infinite variety of shapes, forming one great indiscriminate species. But the world is a hard master, killing off the immense majority, so that none but those sorts that genetically possess special vigor or peculiar advantages for life survive. Animal life, therefore, grows up in surviving scattered streaks, with vast areas of devastated interval between, and those streaks are *species*. This theory could, therefore, only account negatively for there being nothing but these species-streaks; it offered no positive solution for the problem of the origination of existence.

But even as a solution of the variance of species, it has now received from Mivart a concentrated and fatal blow. It is placed beyond all reasonable question that there exists a positive origenerative power, prescribing a definite limit to the variation of animal natures, forming a specific outline configuration which cannot be overpassed. Variation is *within* species, not *of* or *from* species. Some species, as the pigeon, diverge into a great number of varieties; but others, as the goose, are rigidly limited. The horse rapidly improves in speed, but in a few well-trained generations he attains the maximum of speed, and no breeding, no training, can carry him farther.

Mivart denies, with Darwin, that species are produced by special creation; he admits that they arise by variation of forms, and so come by *derivation*. But he denies that they come by minute and accidental variations in any fortuitous direction; he affirms that the variations are sudden and extended, and within the limits of a specific law. Nature does progress by jumps. For this view he furnishes a mass of effective argument.

There are many extended variations and developments in animal organizations which would be disadvantageous or unmeaning unless completed at once. Such are the most important organs of sense, as the eye and the ear. The fleshy movements by which either of these organs are formed are opposite, complex, and in the order of special design; at the same time they have no value until complete. It is, then, impossible to conceive them as form-

ing by infinitesimal accidental variations. So reasons conclusively Mivart against Darwin; and just as conclusively may we not infer against Mivart that a whole animal might spring into existence by special creation as easily as an *ear* by special derivation?

Darwinism suffered a fatal disaster when Professor Thomson announced (as stated in a former Quarterly) that the earth can have been inhabited by animal life no longer than a hundred million of years. Mivart shows that minute variation would require at least twenty-five hundred millions of years. And thus Geology is a great book written by God in refutation of Darwin. On its rocky pages is a succession of tableaux for different periods. And on every tableau abundant species exist in all the independent distinctness of the present age. That tells a conclusive story.

Animals genetically independent of each other are plentifully found, more or less constructed on a similar pattern. The eye and the ear have arisen independently in animals constructed on different plans. The common mouse can scarce be distinguished by the eye from one of the minute Australian marsupials. The bird-of-paradise has many widely diversified varieties, yet all the variations are in different styles of beauty; the esthetic reigns through the whole. This identity of structure in independent species is a very important chapter of evidence both against Atheism and against Darwinism. What right has any reasoner to conclude the genetic identity of man and ape, without historical identification or power of propagation, from resemblances not greater than appear between clearly independent species?

Mr. Mivart re-enforces Wallace's argument derived from the magnitude of savage and fossil human crania. Darwinism assumes that all advantages are necessary for survival; but the savage has a much larger brain than savagery needs or uses. There is prophetic room left for the needs of future civilization. This argument presupposes for man a *designed* inauguration equivalent to the demands of the Genesis history. Hence Mivart's view is that man's body is derived by a jump of evolution from some lower order, but that *the soul is created*. Like a good Catholic, as he appears to be, he quotes Augustine and other fathers to prove the orthodoxy of the doctrine of evolution. His patristic passages, as we read them, however, prove not the derivation of one species from another, but the primitive evolution of all species (but man) from nature by special energy imparted by God to nature. And such, indeed, appears to be the meaning of the sacred text in such words as *God said, Let the earth bring forth, etc., and the earth*

brought forth ; Let the waters bring forth, etc. Such language clearly implies that nature was empowered by God to evolve species from herself, without deciding the rapidity of the evolution. Nor do we see any reason why by this same imparted energy the evolution or creative production of new species in successive æons may not take place. It is an impossibility to Pantheism, an absurdity to Atheism, but a rationality to rational Theism.

We have little sympathy with thinkers who *cannot conceive*, forsooth, a special creation ; for we can conceive a special creation just as easily as we can conceive the process of conception and embryonic formation. Of the interior action of what Owen calls *formification* we have no conception. The difficulty of conceiving special creation means simply that, historically, *we have never seen it*.

On this entire subject of the antiquity of man and its reconcilability with scripture, so far as the question now appears to stand, we note the following points : 1. Darwinism, the derivation of the race from primitive forms by infinitesimal fortuitous variations, may be dismissed from the account as dead. Variation by large, sudden, and law-guided differentiations, as taught by Mivart, is as easily reconcilable with Scripture as the geologic development of our earth. Man's creation through a process of ages is just as concordant with the text as the earth's creation through a process of ages. We are ready to leave that question for science to decide. But so far we see nothing from science, physical or metaphysical, conclusively to prevent our holding firmly to divine immediate creation. 2. But the antiquity of completed man is a different question from the æonic process of completing man. Here linguistics, archæology, and geology must have their say. Professor Hyde's article on The Problem of Babel, in a former Quarterly, clearly shows that language requires no æonic extent of development. Egyptian archæology, as read by La Noye, (see our book-notice of his *Ramses II.*,) requires no extension of even the Hebrew text. Rawlinson teaches that all history is reconcilable with the Septuagint chronology. Murphy in his Commentary of Genesis computes that even according to the Hebrew text the population of the earth in Abraham's time could have been thirty millions, and one half the number would be perhaps sufficient to account for all the well-authenticated historical phenomena. 3. Professor Jewell's late abolition of the æonic man as derived from geology stands not only unrefuted, but confirmed by the lapse

of time. There is a considerable protracted talk among scientists over the dubious proofs, as if they had settled the question affirmatively, but we see no new proofs adduced. The fossils that vouch'd man's geologic antiquity seem themselves coming nearer the surface. New fossils are constantly being disclosed, but no human fossils. Our verdict is, as yet, that the Mosaic age of man is *not disproved*. 4. If the perfect æonic man becomes demonstrated, we say decisively that the theory advocated by the Duke of Argyll and by Dr. J. P. Thomson, which throws the Adamic creation back by geologic ages, we hold to be utterly irreconcilable with the sacred text. Turn to the genealogies of Genesis and you will find them a double and twisted cord, which can be untwisted by no allowable exegesis, nor cut by any but the sharpest and most unscrupulous knife. We should fall back upon the theory, advocated with great learning and eloquence by Dr. M'Causland, (see our notice of his book,) of the plurality of the human species, and of the late creation of the Adamic or Edenic or Caucasian variety.

Force and Matter: Empirico-Philosophical Studies, Intelligibly Rendered. With an Additional Introduction expressly written for the English Edition. By Dr. LOUIS BÜCHNER, President of the Medical Association of Hessen-Darmstadt, etc., etc. Edited, from the last edition of "Kraft und Stoff," by J. FREDERICK COLLINGWOOD, F.R.S.L., F.G.S. 12mo, pp. 271. London: Trübner & Co. 1870.

Though, separated from its prefaces, this work is but a tract of 271 small pages, yet it is the great manifesto of godlessness, and Büchner is *The Atheist of Europe*. It is heralded with one hundred and three pages of preface, or rather prefaces, to ten successive editions, written in high defiant style, boasting of translations into all the languages of Europe, and treating his opponents with triumphant sneer and ostensible refutation. Since the *Système de la Nature* of d'Holbach, nothing so bold has appeared. It possesses none of the semi-poetic grace of that work; but Büchner exhibits, in behalf of a still more radical creed, the strong, coarse, and almost blatant, vigor of deistical Thomas Paine.

We promptly reject the doctrine, of which, for a brief period, the North American Review was made the organ, that Atheism is not a demoralization and a just ground of personal disapprobation of its advocate. Doubtless an Atheist may have his natural excellences, and yet in the center there is a moral desert. Of this the pitiable Büchner is an illustration. What but a moral perversion at the center—a sad reversal of the deepest and best sensibilities of our nature—can send forth such an utterance as the following in regard to our own personal immortality? "The thought of an *eternal life* is more terrifying than the idea of eternal annihilation. The latter is by

no means repugnant to a philosophical thinker. Annihilation, non-existence, is perfect rest, painlessness, freedom from all tormenting impressions, and therefore not to be feared. There can be no pain in annihilation, as little as in profound sleep, but merely in the conception of annihilation. . . . The idea of an eternal life—of not being able to die—is, on the contrary, the most horrid that human fancy can invent, and its horrors have long been expressed in the legend of the never-dying Ahasuerus.”—Pp. 204, 205.

And as in his view matter is the sole real existence, and mind, thought, is, like combustion, but one of its incidents, so thought may utterly cease, and the universe hereafter become one mass of irrecoverable unintelligence. “Physics show that, as there was a time when no organic life existed on earth, so will the time arrive—no doubt an infinite and incommensurable period—when the physical forces now existing will be exhausted, and all animated beings plunged into night and death. What are, in the presence of such facts, the pompous phrases of a philosophy about the designs which became accomplished in the creation of man; the incarnation of God in history; the history of humanity as the subjective unavailing of the absolute; the eternity of conscience, liberty, and will, etc.? What are the life and the efforts of man, and all humanity, compared with the eternal, inexorable, irresistible, half-accidental, half-necessary march of nature? The momentary play of an ephemeron, hovering over the sea of eternity and infinity.”—P. 105.

In the hearty eagerness with which Büchner riots in hideousnesses like these, it is, that we recognize the truly hateful moral perversion in which Atheism originates and into which it reacts. A poor relief of the blackness here displayed appears in the *courage* with which the moral sentiments of the best of our race are braved; especially when that courage is contrasted with the paltering cowardice of men like Maudelesley, who manifest the wish to produce the conclusions of Büchner covered by shams and ambiguities.

If the perusal of Büchner does not increase our moral respect for the Atheist, if it reveals very clearly to the naked eye that he is centrally and intensely a morally detestable man, its argument does not increase our respect for his intuitive or logical intellect. They are a poor, base, brutal set—the very “hogs of Epicurus’ sty”—who are convinced by *such* arguments. From the deep corruption of the heart the effluvium ascends to stultify and madden the brain. Such moral rottenness may and does prove contagious; it seizes on, and rages among, moral constitutions congenial to it; it may, from the stench and racket it makes, seem

for a while victorious over the age; but it cannot truly conquer. Not only is there a God in heaven, but there is an assertion of God in the human spirit that will ever reign triumphant in an ever-increasing Church on earth. We must say that we rise from the perusal of Büchner with an intense moral abhorrence of the man, with a deep revulsion against his whole system, and with a profounder, firmer, more exulting conviction that God lives and reigns, than we felt in closing the study of Buchanan's able advocacy of Theism.

Büchner's book consists of twenty-one brief chapters. Of these, seven discuss what may be called the cosmical metaphysics of the question; as, 1, on Force and Matter in their nature; 2, the Immortality of Matter, and, 3, that of Force; 4, the Infinity, and, 5, the Dignity of Matter; 6, the Immutability, and, 7, the Universality of the Laws of Nature. Three chapters discuss empirical views of external nature; as 8, the Heavens in which no-God is inferred from Astronomy; 9, the Earth-Periods in which no-God is inferred from Geology, or, 10, from Primeval Creation or the Origination of Life. One chapter, 11, attempts to refute the argument from Design by showing what absurdities, misarrangements, and cruelties exist in nature. The remaining ten chapters discuss the psycho-physiological questions, showing that soul is mere brain; that there are no innate ideas, and so none of God; that immortality, or, as he calls it, "personal continuance," is imaginary and undesirable; that "vital force" is simply the combination of chemical and mechanical forces; that brutes have intellect the same in nature and less in degree than man; and, finally, that true morals, based upon mutual "give and take" among men, are amply provided for in Atheism. On the whole we suggest:

1. Matter and force alone in universal space could never give us a systematized world. Without directive mind, including perception and volition, matter could never be lifted by mere unintelligent force out of chaos. Every divergence, however slight, from pure unmeaning chaos into plan is demonstrative of mind. The clearer the plan, the clearer the design. But we cannot open our eyes without seeing that the world is not chaos. When we contemplate the wide, wide world, we every-where recognize, just as plainly as we recognize visible things, that those visible things have meaning and plan in them.

2. Defects, mal-adjustments, supernumerary limbs, disprove not the *design*, but only impeach the perfect wisdom of the designer. That man has no wings for flying does not disprove that his feet were

made for walking. "Contrivances," says Büchner, "apparently purposeless, are numerous in the structure of animals and plants." True, but without design there would be no "contrivance," no "structure," no "animals," no "plants," nothing but chaos. All these disorders are indeed *difficulties* in the way of maintaining the absolute wisdom and goodness of the designing mind; and, as being mere difficulties and not refutations, are justly and fairly obviated by rational hypotheses so as to form a theodicy.

3. Touching the existence of defects in creation let us note the following points: (1.) Creation, unless the absolutely perfect should create another absolutely perfect—that is, unless God should create solely another God—must be limited and dependent, and therefore imperfect. A universe of archangels would suffer under the evil of limitation, mutual collision, and dependence. (2.) In a complete universe our minds seem to demand an infinite variety of existences and natures, ranks and orders. But in order to such variety there must be those that are lower, who suffer under their inferiority. (3.) In a complete universe there ought to be free beings, able, in a limited area, to act with a little independence and responsibility of their own. The whole should not be a mere machinery. There should be the dignity of liberty and government working out their development and results. But free-agency thus implies the possibility of evil doing, transgression of the perfect law of eternal right. Thus there must be the created capability for sin, the broad area spread for possible sin, the permanent systematic non-prevention of actual sin. The greater the magnitude of this governmental and judicial system, and the higher its worth and dignity, the greater must be the power and possibility of sin on the one hand and of rectitude on the other; the more perfect should be the law under which it exists, and the more wonderful the blending of intense justice with condescending mercy, and the rich results of ultimate glory. (4.) For the development of the activity of living beings, and especially of free moral agents, surrounding evils to be escaped and goods to be attained are necessary. There must be the possible prize of good to bring out the eager putting forth of strength for the attainment. There must be the menacing evil and the shock of danger to arouse the vigorous spring of escape. And, especially in the moral world, for all high unfolding of virtue there must be temptation to vice. Seductions to soft indulgences are necessary for the development of heroic constancy; the fires of persecution are necessary to the most glorious of all spectacles to us known in the universe—*the martyr's crown*.

Temptations to the intellect, even to believe a damnable lie, are necessary for the display of a high moral faith. There must be contingencies in the political world to afford possibility for a Jefferson Davis, in the commercial world to afford area for a James Fisk, Jun., in the scientific and moral world to allow plausibility to a Louis Büchner. We do not say that the wicked deeds of these men must by them be performed, but that there must be power and room for their performance. And from their performance God will, with none the less damnation to them, reap his harvest of good results. (5.) What wonder, then, that the physical world should respond in due degree to this quality of the intelligent moral world? There must be in such a world uniformities so that men may calculate and infer, and contingencies by which they must be left in doubt. There must be pleasures and pains, more or less consequent upon conduct. There must be laws and natural processes, which exceptionally cross and defeat each other. Earthquakes, pestilences, malformed limbs, and monstrous births are, in such a system, no inexplicable problems. Yet, amid all this mingling of order and disorder, what a cheering point will be the development of *progress!* But no man can disprove that defects are necessary both in and to the best possible universe.

Psychology; or, The Science of Mind. By Rev. OLIVER MUNSELL, D.D., President of Illinois University. 12mo., pp. 318. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

This volume is the product of a zealous amateur, a persevering student, and an eminent instructor in the department to which it belongs. It claims to be "a hand-book for the student, not a guide for the expert." As such it may be pronounced a marked success.

The structure of the work is remarkably symmetrical. It embraces an outline of the entire subject, expressed in a style which equally avoids diffuseness and over-conciseness, and arranged with admirable system, assigning the right place for every thing, and every thing in its place. Though there are some subordinate points of doctrine in which we should dissent from the author, and some methods of treatment that we should avoid, yet, as a whole, Dr. Munsell's system we hold to be consistent, noble, Christian, and true. He adopts the views of the latest great thinkers in mental science, but with an independent discrimination. He rejects, of course, with earnest decision the merging psychology in physiology, as in effect merging mind in matter. He owes much to Sir William Hamilton, without accepting his extreme doctrine of Nescience. He accords, with McCosh, valid

knowledge to the mind of man, and finds not a distinct "God-consciousness" in the soul, but a necessary process of truly-developed mind by which it arrives at an infinite Personal Cause of the existing universe. His analysis of our moral nature is accurate and complete. He maintains with perfect explicitness the distinctness of the faculty of the Will and its freedom as opposed to necessity.

Some rigid skeptics may object to Dr. Munsell's extended treatment, as well as to some of his unshrinking statements (founded in some instances upon his own experiences) of Dreams, Cataleptic Sleep, Visions, Clairvoyance, and Natural Presentiment. The facts of experience on these subjects ought not to be suppressed. Neither the fear of logical consequences, nor the difficulty of eliminating the false from the true, justifies us in being untrue to the true. It strongly confirms us in this view to note that there is no point at which Louis Büchner howls more sonorously than at the application of this very class of facts to the refutation of materialism.

Both from the brevity of his work and from his rigid view of the proper purity and completeness of psychology as a science, Dr. Munsell excludes the mixture of physiology with his statements of mental facts and principles in which Alexander Bain and the materialistic school so much delight. Psychology is *the analysis and classification of our mental operations*, just as botany is the analysis and classification of plants. Except as a mere aid, without confounding two sciences, the botanist does not introduce vegetable physiology or organic chemistry into his treatise. Even if thoughts were nothing but the motions of the brain, one would think that the systematizing thoughts into a science might be quite as desirable as the systematizing vegetables. Such a science cannot but be of highest importance, and the depreciation of its value can arise from no elevated motive. And that depreciation arrives at its violent extreme in even questioning the authority of consciousness. Dr. Munsell firmly and rightly asserts Psychology to be "the basal science in the hierarchy of sciences, underlying and vitalizing all the rest." It is the ground in which all sciences are rooted.

We take two exceptions to Dr. Munsell's book. His terms and phrases from the very commencement are in the highest and most uncompromising style of science, presupposing that his pupil has beforehand swallowed his vocabulary. Thus, at the very beginning, the three laws of method are stated, without explanation,

in Hamilton's own highly technical words; and the author's own modes of expression are not less merciless for the pupil commencing without a teacher. We dissent, also, from his omitting all history of science, nearly all reference to the great thinkers, and all guidance for the pupil in prosecuting farther studies. An additional chapter, furnishing a course of psychological and metaphysical reading, would be a matter both of interest and advantage to his young readers.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art, for 1871, Exhibiting the Most Important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc., together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the Year 1870; a List of Recent Scientific Publications; Obituaries of Eminent Scientific Men, etc. Edited by JOHN TROWBRIDGE, S.B., Assistant Professor of Physics in Harvard College; Aided by W. R. NICHOLS, Assistant Professor of Chemistry in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and C. R. CROSS, Graduate of the Institute. 12mo, pp. 349. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Company. 1871.

The Editor's introductory notes summarizing the Progress of Science during 1870, filling twenty-two pages, indicate that the scientific world has been alive and active, but no epochal discovery has occurred.

Darwinism does not seem to rule in this quite so ascendantly as in former volumes. There is still much confident talk over the great antiquity of the human race, but it is all based upon the scanty evidences heretofore discussed. Geological researches are every-where extending, but no fresh disclosures of unquestionable human fossils console the *savans* who have crowed so sonorously over a few dubious cases in the past.

The "American Journal of Science and Arts" thus discusses *The Brain of Man and the Man-Apes*:

The collections of Dr. J. B. Davis and Dr. Morton give the following as the average internal capacity of the cranium in the chief races: Teutonic family, 94 cubic inches; Esquimaux, 91 cubic inches; Negroes, 85 cubic inches; Australians and Tasmanians, 82 cubic inches; Bushmen, 77 cubic inches. These last numbers, however, are deduced from comparatively few specimens, and may be below the average, just as a small number of Finns and Cossacks give 98 cubic inches, or considerably more than that of the German races. It is evident, therefore, that the absolute bulk of the brain is not necessarily much less in savage than in civilized man, for Esquimaux skulls are known with a capacity of 113 inches, or hardly less than the largest among Europeans. While the largest Teutonic skull in Dr. Davis's collection is 112.4 cubic inches, there is an Araucanian of 115.5, an Esquimaux of 113.1, a Marquesan of 110.6, a Negro of 105.8, and even an Australian of 104.5 cubic inches. But what is still more extraordinary, the few remains yet known of pre-historic man do not indicate any material diminution in the size of the brain-case. A Swiss skull of the stone age, found in the lake dwelling of Meilen, corresponded exactly to that of a Swiss youth of the present day. The celebrated Neanderthal skull had a larger circumference than the average, and its capacity, indicating actual mass of brain, is estimated to have been not less than 75 cubic inches, or nearly the average of existing Australian crania. The Engis skull, per-

haps the oldest known, and which, according to Sir John Lubbock, "there seems no doubt was really contemporary with the mammoth and the cave bear," is yet, according to Professor Huxley, "a fair average skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage." Of the cave men of Les Eyzies, who were undoubtedly contemporary with the reindeer in the south of France, Professor Paul Broca says, (in a paper read before the Congress of Pre-historic Archaeology, in 1868:) "The great capacity of the brain, the development of the frontal region, the fine elliptical form of the anterior part of the profile of the skull, are uncontested characteristics of superiority, such as we are accustomed to meet with in civilized races." We cannot fail to be struck with the apparent anomaly that many of the lowest savages should have as much brains as average Europeans. The idea is suggested of a surplusage of power; of an instrument beyond the need of its possessor. In order to discover if there is any foundation for this notion, let us compare the brain of man with that of animals. The adult male orang-outang is quite as bulky as a small-sized man, while the gorilla is considerably above the average size of man as estimated by bulk and weight; yet the former has a brain of only 28 cubic inches, the latter one of 30, or, in the largest specimen yet known, of 34½ cubic inches. We see, then, that whether we compare the savage with the higher developments of man, or with the brutes around him, we are alike driven to the conclusion that in his large and well-developed brain he possesses an organ quite disproportionate to his actual requirements; an organ that seems prepared in advance, only to be fully utilized as he progresses in civilization. A brain slightly larger than that of the gorilla would, according to the evidence before us, fully have sufficed for the limited mental development of the savage; and we must therefore admit, that the large brain he actually possesses could never have been solely developed by any of those laws of evolution, whose essence is that they lead to a degree of organization exactly proportionate to the wants of each species, never beyond those wants; that no preparation can be made for the future development of the race; that one part of the body can never increase in size or complexity, except in strict co-ordination to the pressing wants of the whole. The brain of pre-historic and of savage man seems to me to prove the existence of some power distinct from that which has guided the development of the lower animals through their ever-varying forms of being.—Pp. 297, 298.

Professor Winchell thus reports the peat beds of Michigan:

They inclose numerous remains of the mastodon and mammoth. They are sometimes found so near the surface that one could believe they have been buried within 500 or 1,000 years. For the first time, too, the remains of the gigantic extinct beaver of North America have been recently found in Michigan. What is perhaps most interesting of all is the discovery of a flint arrow-head in a similar situation. This arrow-head was found seven feet beneath the surface, in a ditch excavated in the southern part of Washtenaw County. The mastodon remains found near Tecumseh, but a few miles distant, lay but two and one half feet beneath the surface. The Adrian mastodon was buried but three feet deep.—P. 239.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Works of Rev. Leonidas L. Hamline, D.D., late one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Edited by Rev. F. G. HIBBARD, D.D. Vol. II. Miscellaneous Writings. 12mo., pp. 495. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

The "Church Review" (Episcopal) pronounces Bishop Hamline to be "the most extraordinary man for exquisite culture, manly *græe*, impressive eloquence and saintly piety, whom Methodism has produced on this continent, and who, in grasp and brilliance

of genius, has had scarcely a superior in America." Dr. Summers, of the "Nashville Advocate," whose skill in furnishing for his readers a good literary table is first-class, gives a vivid description, which we have mislaid, of the unsurpassed impressiveness, in the delivery, of one of the sermons in this volume. Few speeches ever pronounced in our General Conference were more decisive in their effect than that on the case of Bishop Andrew. While it is most modest in spirit, it is brilliant in style and demonstrative in its argument.

The present volume embraces Sermon Sketches, Addresses, and Theological Essays. We shall hope to give a full article when the entire work is complete.

The discussion lately moved in regard to quadrennializing the Episcopal office seems to have sprung less from the spontaneous feeling of the Church than from individual agencies. Its only good, we apprehend, will be to bring clearer views of the Episcopacy before the minds of the Church. To our mind the following points are clear :

1. However much the Bishops are the creatures of the General Conference, a creature has his rights, and a creator is under obligations to exercise his powers under the laws of right and duty. The General Conference has the *power* to omit the election of Bishops and so let the "creature" become extinct, just as it has the *power* to omit assembling together and becoming itself extinct, and just as the Bishops have the *power* to omit appointing Annual Conferences and allowing them to become extinct. But, however these *powers* may exist, the *right* does not exist. The General Conference is bound conscientiously to elect the due number of Bishops, to ordain them, and to do what it can within constitutional limits to give efficiency and success to the office, so as to produce the best good to the Church, and the highest glory of God through the office.

2. The Bishops elect have as perfect a right to ordination as the Elders elect or the Deacons elect to ordination from the Bishop. The orders of the Bishop were obtained from the ordination by Mr. Wesley. He was the founder, the spiritual Archbishop, the epochal man at the epochal period, by whom the ordination was conferred. That ordination he held to confer the right of ordaining men empowered thereby to administer the sacrament. The office conferred on Coke had all the attributes we can ascribe to an order; namely, ordination, exclusive right to ordain, life tenure, and successional permanence in the future. To the day of

his death Mr. Wesley preached to his preachers in England that they were not presbyters, but only evangelists; that for them to assume the priestly office and administer the sacraments without ordination was to commit the sin of Korah. Yet he did believe that his was the providential endowment to ordain a Bishop for America according to the practice of the primitive Church. And when the proper ordination of Bishop was performed, Coke was as true a Bishop as if he had been ordained by the Archbishop of Canterbury. And it was just that same Episcopate constituted by Wesley, with the same nature and tenure, whether of office or order, that our General Conference incorporated into our system. And our fundamental enactment that that Episcopate cannot be diocesanized without the vote of the Annual Conferences assumes an equal permanence of the same, in essence and tenure, in our constitution.

3. It seems to us a very peculiar opinion which holds that ordination is an insignificant matter—an opinion at variance not only with the opinion of the universal Church, and with the universal opinion hitherto of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but even at variance with the New Testament. How earnestly did Paul enjoin Timothy to lay hands suddenly on no man! We do not say that a Church or ministry cannot exist without ordination, but we do say that such a Church or ministry is formally defective, and that its neglect or repudiation of a divinely sanctioned though not divinely enjoined institute must be condemned by the Christian conscience. Whenever under the approbation of the great head of the Church the foundations of a new Church are laid, and its structure reared, *ordination is the divinely sanctioned mode of authorization for the ministry of the word and the sacraments.* And though a Church may shape itself into such form as is providentially best adapted to effect its true purposes, and though other forms of Church government are doubtless permissible, yet we believe Episcopacy to be apostolically sanctioned, though not enjoined, and primarily the best form of government for the most efficient evangelical action. And when a Church with the three ranks is established, it is the presumptive fact, sanctioned by the New Testament and by all history, that the three ordinations alike confer a life tenure.

4. It is held by many in our Church that the Eldership and deaconship are orders, while the Bishopric is only an office. Dr. Bangs defended our Church government on that hypothesis, (in which Hamline concurred,) and so, as we once said in our Quarterly, "made Presbyterians of us all." And we have not long since

seen it stated, even in some of our official papers, that we are in fact Presbyterians. The ablest of American Methodist theologians, however, Dr. Wilbur Fisk, entirely repudiated that view.* Such a position involves us in the most inextricable contradictions. Are not our Bishops consecrated by the most solemn of the three ordinations? How can there be an *ordination* if not to an *order*? In the form of bestowing the three trusts professedly under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is any intimation that one is less an order than the other? Surely we are not after all the Methodist Presbyterian Church, or the Methodist Congregational Church, but, if we mistake not, we are truly the Methodist EPISCOPAL Church.

The writer of these lines claims that the Church bestowed upon him a life-long Eldership, unless forfeited by his own act. The Church professed to confer that permanent right upon him by the authority of God and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. What moral right has she to either falsify her profession, or to break her compact and degrade her dutiful Elder? But she has in the same way, and with still more solemn act, conferred what all understood to be a life-long Bishopric upon our present living Bishops. What right has she to revoke it? We deeply doubt whether there is the rightful power in the Church to quadrennialize the tenure of the present existing incumbents.

5. It was entirely in the power of the American Church, without denying the validity of his ordination, to accept or reject Bishop Coke. Or they could take him for a year, or for a term of years, without affecting his ordinate rank. But after they have incorporated the ordained rank or office into the system of the Church, and have resolved themselves into the Methodist EPISCOPAL Church, that ordained rank has the same tenure as the two other ordained ranks—the Eldership and the Deaconship. The ordination is equally claimable by the elect, is equally indelible, and requires an equal authority to abolish. The individual Bishop, Elder, or Deacon may, indeed, be judicially dealt with, suspended, degraded, or expelled. He may, like Coke, be allowed leave of

* And so in effect did Wesley. He said in 1756: "I still believe the Episcopal form of Church government to agree with the practice and writings of the Apostles; but that it is prescribed in Scripture I do not believe. This, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's 'Irenicon.' I think he has unanswerably proved that *neither Christ nor his Apostles prescribe any particular form of Church government.*" Of course, then, they no more prescribed *two* orders than *three*. For Presbyterianism Wesley had a strong aversion, and Dr. Bangs's Presbyterian theory was neither Wesleyanism nor Methodism. The three grades are alike office or order.

absence, or, like Hamline, to resign; but if either return to duty no reordination would be required. He may, like Andrew, suffer suspension of function for unacceptability. The *form*, not the *essence*, of the ordination may be modified. But none of these things can the General Conference do *for the PURPOSE* of impairing the constitutional Episcopate itself, or subtracting any of the elements of an *order* above enumerated as included by Wesley. And any sweeping act by which these three co-ordinate grades (or either of them) can be at once organically quadrennialized so as periodically to ungown us all, requires a power behind the General Conference greater than the General Conference itself.

6. We have thus far argued as to the *powers* of the General Conference to quadrennialize the Episcopate. We do not think that the office or order is so purely at the mercy of any one jaunty majority that may happen to happen. It will require at least the rounds of the annual conferences. But the *desirableness* of the change either from Scripture sanction or sacred expediency is the reverse of probable. We believe our Episcopal officers to be as genuine Scriptural Bishops, and as true an order, as Christendom can present. We believe that our present Church organization, just as it is, vindicates its superior claims for *success* above any thing in Protestantism. We believe that in imparting to our Church conservation, unity, elasticity of action, and structural impressiveness upon the public mind, our untouched Episcopacy secures a large share of that success. The full power of these points is largely attained by the prestige, and even the irresponsibility, secured by the life tenure. The need of all these points is enhanced by the introduction of Lay Representation. The unifying power of a genuine Episcopacy over the two forces, lay and clerical, securing a proper balance in the Church for the ministry, is of prime importance.

7. The quadrennializing the Episcopate at once degrades it from being an *order*, and enfeebles it in all those points which give it value. For then, of course, the Episcopal ordination should be abolished. And then we should re-christen ourselves the Methodist Presbyterian Church. And if then the full torrent of radicalism sets strong and sweeping, we shall within a quadrennium or two further have to re-re-christen ourselves the Methodist Congregational Church. But as the Congregationalists maintain a reverent observance of ordination, we may ultimately re-re-re-christen ourselves the Methodist Quaker Church. Now perhaps we are personally growing fogy and fossil; for we have a

pretty extended range of deep and hallowed recollections binding us in heart to the Church of our morning, our meridian, and our ripening afternoon. It was the Methodist Episcopal Church that rocked our cradle; and we trust it may be the Methodist Episcopal Church that will consecrate our hearse.

The Life and Times of Henry, Lord Brougham. Written by Himself. In Three Volumes. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 380. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Brougham is a striking proof that precocity of intellect is not always premature and prophetic of early decay. He was a marvelous boy and a marvelous octogenarian. He was made on a large scale, a natural great man, yet not so symmetrically great as to be free from depreciating eccentricities. As a very young writer on the profoundest topics of science, as one of the brilliant set of young madcaps who founded the Edinburgh Review, as a Parliamentary orator, as the great counsel of Queen Caroline in her State trial, as an illustrious leader in the cause of freedom in an age of High Toryism, he filled a large space in the public notice. He was endowed with magnetic power over the public mind; and, especially to those whose memories embrace a large share of his career, his memoirs written by himself will possess a fascinating interest.

Want of space precludes our ranging over the scenes of history of which his pages give a fresh glimpse, or even to trace his individual career. But we will simply note the fact that in his young days he once made an appointment to see a ghost, and the ghost kept the appointment! He made an agreement with a young friend, signed with the blood of each, that whichever first died should, if possible, revisit the other, in order to assure him of the immortality of the soul. His friend departed for India. Years after, on a nineteenth of December, Brougham is in his bath, and beholds his friend sitting in the chair where his own clothes are deposited. He subsequently learned that his friend died in India on that self-same nineteenth of December. This was a regular *wraith*. His Lordship goes through the usual routine of so-called reasoning on the subject; being that very valid sort of logic where the conclusion is voluntarily fixed beforehand, and such premises as can afterward be patched up are duly placed as antecedent to it.

Fifty Years a Presiding Elder. By PETER CARTWRIGHT, D.D., of the Illinois Conference.

Whatever differences of view a large share of the Church has entertained, all are at the present hour unanimous in kindly recollec-

tions of the great services rendered by Peter Cartwright to Methodism and to our country. His history and character, typical yet unique, have impressed the public mind, without as well as within our pale, in Europe as well as in America. Even the most eminent Review of Paris some years since gave a full article upon his history, as a phenomenon worth the study of the present day. The present volume is not a biography, but a series of characteristic sketches, followed with a full report of the Cartwright Jubilee. The speech of Bishop Thomson upon that occasion, so worthy of the pure genius of that son of genius, is alone worth the price of the book. A hundred thousand copies ought to be bought, both as a memorial of Cartwright, and as a means of enabling him easily to walk down the evening vale closing his already near ninety years of pilgrimage.

The Life and Letters of Hugh Miller. By PETER BAYNE, M.A., author of "The Christian Life," etc. In two volumes. Vols. I and II. 12mo, pp. 431, 497. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1871.

Romance and science are wonderfully blended in the history and character of Hugh Miller. Yet fascinating as was his character, and brilliant as his achievements, he died before his work was done. His personal friend, Dr. M'Cosh, says that if he had lived he would certainly have grappled with the Positive Philosophy as he did with the *Vestiges of Creation*. His life is written by Mr. Bayne with freshness and reality, and few biographies are so full of romantic interest upon every page.

History of the State of New York. By JOHN ROMEYN BRODHEAD. Second Volume. First Edition. 8vo., pp. 680. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

A portraiture of the State of New York promising to be nearly as large as life. Yet so able and interesting is the work, that no New Yorker, born, as we, to the manor, would quite like to wish it smaller. We suppose neither the Harpers nor the true-born Dutch-Yankee author will find it "pay," but the Empire State should have an empire history.

Consecrated Talents; or, The Life of Mrs. Mary W. Mason. With an Introduction by BISHOP JANES. 12mo., pp. 285. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1870.

Mrs. Mason's name and face were familiar to a goodly circle of friends in New York Methodism, who are gratified to welcome this memorial of her virtues, abilities, and well-doings. It was her opportunity, well-improved, to be in a measure a foundress, and the mementoes of her life are permanently around us.

Literature and Fiction.

Chips from a German Workshop. By F. MAX MULLER, M. A., Foreign Member of the French Institute, etc. Volume III. Essays on Literature, Biography, and Antiquities. 12mo., pp. 492. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

This basket of Max's *Chips* is a gathering of his "fugitive pieces," heretofore appearing in various periodicals and other ephemeral vehicles. They range mostly over old German history and literature, and more modern German characters, as Schiller, Wilhelm Müller, and Bunsen. A full article on the last, followed by an extensive series of letters from Bunsen to Max, form a large and very interesting part of the volume. The blending in Bunsen of the unfaith of a rationalist with the religious fervor of a Methodist is rare in human character. It is mixture without affinity, which can seldom be repeated.

My Study Windows. By JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, A.M. 12mo., pp. 433. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1871.

Mr. Lowell discourses in fluent style, and with something of the insight of genius, on the surface affairs of secular human life. He is a literary essayist. To those whose life is leisurely, and who have no very deep moral consciousness, his ruminations will be found attractive and refining. But with men of another style, who feel that "life is earnest," and that eternal responsibilities rest upon its passing hours, such aliment may be but "wheatless straws."

Periodicals.

Home and Health. A Monthly Magazine devoted to Health and the Home Circle. New York: W. R. De Puy & Brother. 8vo., pp. 96.

The principles and maxims of health were in former times, like the maxims of common law, circulated orally and transmitted traditionally. The era of types has enabled a more thorough science to circulate them more effectively and broadly in books and periodicals. These periodicals are very cheap, since they communicate knowledge that saves us many a medical bill. Among the best of the class we rank the neat publication before us, issued from our Book-Room building, though unconnected with the "Concern." The managers are the sons of the able assistant editor of our *Advocate*, and will thence be aided by the most efficient counsel. It has a fine corps of contributors, is cordially indorsed by the press, and is destined, we trust, to run a beneficent and successful career.

Miscellaneous.

The Model Pastor. A Memoir of the Life and Correspondence of Rev. Baron Stow, D.D., late Pastor of the Rowe--street Baptist Church, Boston. By JOHN C. STOCKBRIDGE, D.D. 12mo., pp. 376. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.

Dr. Stow possessed a national reputation, and this memoir will be acceptable to a wide circle of revering friends.

Science for the Young—Heat. By JACOB ABBOTT, author of "The Franconia Stories." "Abbott's Illustrated Histories," etc. With numerous engravings. 18mo., pp. 306. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

An effort to give in popular style of narrative and dialogue the attractive mysteries of latest science.

Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistle to the Romans. Designed for Bible Classes and Sunday-Schools. By ALBERT BARNES, Author of "Notes on the Psalms," etc., etc. Tenth Edition. Revised and Corrected. 12mo., pp. 367. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The Knightly Soldier. A Biography of Major Henry Ward Camp, Tenth Connecticut Volunteers. By Chaplain H. CLAY TRUMBULL. Sixth Edition Revised. 12mo., pp. 335. Boston: Noyes, Holmes, & Co. 1871.

The Wonders of the Heavens. By CAMILLE FLAMMARION. From the French. By Mrs. NORMAN LOCKYER. With forty eight illustrations. 18mo., pp. 289. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

The Conversion of St. Paul. Three Discourses. By GEORGE JARVIS GEER, D.D., Rector of St. Timothy's Church. 12mo., pp. 80. New York: S. R. Wells.

Ad Fidem; or, Parish Evidences of the Bible. By Rev. E. F. BURR, D. D., Author of "Ecce Caelum" and "Pater Mundi." 12mo., pp. 353. Boston: Noyes, Holmes, & Co.

The Lord's Prayer. By HENRY J. VAN DYKE, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. 12mo., pp. 194. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.

One With Christ in Glory. Thoughts on John XVII. With a Revised Version from the Critical Greek Text and the Authorized Version. Illuminated. By JAMES INGLIS, Editor of "The Witness" and "Waymarks in the Wilderness." 24mo., pp. 127. New York: J. Inglis & Co. 1871.

The Holy Sabbath Instituted in Paradise, and Perfected through Christ. A Historical Demonstration. By WILLIAM HARRIS RULE, D.D. 18mo., pp. 160. London: S. W. Partridge & Co.

Shakspeare's Comedy of the Merchant of Venice. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A. M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 168. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Public Ledger Almanac, 1871. 12mo., pp. 56. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. *The History of Rome.* By TITUS LIVIUS. Two volumes, Books 1-30. Literally Translated, with Notes. By D. SPILLANS, A.M., M.D. 12mo., pp. 747, 725. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Sophocles ex novissima recensione. GUILIELMI DINDORFI. 24mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Neat pocket edition, without notes, flexible cover, handsomely printed.

Points of Controversy. By Rev. C. W. MILLER, A.M., of Kentucky Conference, M. E. Church, South. 24mo., pp. 159. St. Louis: Northwestern Book and Publishing Company. 1871.

A fresh contribution to the baptismal debate.

Sober Thoughts on Staple Themes. By RICHARD RANDOLPH, Author of "Windfalls," etc. 18mo., pp. 159. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1871.

Diary of the Besieged Resident in Paris. Reprinted from the London "Daily News." With Several New Letters and Preface. 8vo., pp. 131. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The Two Brothers, and Other Poems. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, M.A., Author of "Yesterday, To-Day, and Forever." 12mo., pp. 324. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.

Windfalls. By the Author of "Aspects of Humanity." 12mo., pp. 107. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1871.

Fresh Leaves from the Book and Its Story. By L. N. R., Author of "The Book and Its Story," "Missing Link," etc. With more than Fifty Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 500. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.

Desk and Debit; or, The Catastrophes of a Clerk. By OLIVER OPTIC. With Fourteen Illustrations. Red and gilt, 16mo., pp. 334. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.

Memoir of the Life and Character of Rev. Lewis Warner Green, D.D. With a Selection from His Sermons. By LE ROY J. HALSEY, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the North-West. 12mo., pp. 491. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

Memories of Patmos; or, Some of the Great Words and Visions of the Apocalypse. By J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. 12mo., pp. 352. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.

The Woman and Her Accusers. A Plea for the Midnight Mission. Delivered in Several of the Churches of New York and Brooklyn. By W. A. MUHLENBERG, D.D., Pastor and Superintendent of St. Luke's Hospital. Sold for the Benefit of The Midnight Mission. 12mo., pp. 72. New York: Pliny F. Smith. 1871.

A Hand-Book of English Literature. Intended for the Use of High Schools, as well as a Companion and Guide for Private Students and for General Readers. By FRANCIS H. UNDERWOOD. Vol. I. British Authors. 12mo., pp. 592. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.

The Model Prayer. A Course of Lectures on the Lord's Prayer. By GEORGE C. BALDWIN, D.D. Green and gilt, tinted paper, 16mo., pp. 298. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1871.

God's Rescues; or, The Lost Sheep, The Lost Coin, and The Lost Son. Three Discourses on Luke XV. By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. 18mo., pp. 95. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1871.

John Wesley: His Life and His Work. By the Rev. MATTHEW LELIEVRE. Translated by the Rev. A. J. French, B.A. 18mo., pp. 274. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1871.

Fiction.

Olive. A Novel. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." 12mo., pp. 428. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

One of a series of Miss Mulock's works.

Opportunities: A Sequel to "What She Could." By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World." 18mo., pp. 382. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.

Motherless; or, A Parisian Family. From the French of MADAME GUIZOT DE WITT. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." For Girls in their Teens. With Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 253. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The Head of the Family. A Novel. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," "Olive," etc. 12mo., pp. 528. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The American Cardinal. A Novel. 12mo., pp. 315. New York: Dodd & Mead.

Suzanne De L'Orme. A Story of Huguenot Times. 12mo., pp. 299. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.

The Ogilvies. A Novel. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." 12mo., pp. 421. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Received too late for notice in this number:

War Powers under the Constitution. By WILLIAM WHITING. Lee & Shepard.

Science and the Bible. By Prof. MORRIS. Ziegler & McCurdy.